







IN DEFENSE OF TOMORROW





THE MACMILLAN COMPANY  
NEW YORK • BOSTON • CHICAGO • DALLAS  
ATLANTA • SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED  
LONDON • BOMBAY • CALCUTTA  
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY  
OF CANADA, LIMITED  
TORONTO

# IN DEFENSE OF TOMORROW

---

BY ROBERT DOUGLAS BOWDEN

HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SCIENCES,  
YOUNGSTOWN COLLEGE IN OHIO

NEW YORK  
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY  
1931

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

COPYRIGHT, 1931,  
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

---

All rights reserved — no part of this book  
may be reproduced in any form without  
permission in writing from the publisher,  
except by a reviewer who wishes to quote  
brief passages in connection with a review  
written for inclusion in magazine or  
newspaper.

---

Set up and printed. Published October, 1931. Reprinted  
December, 1931.

NORWOOD PRESS LINOTYPE, INC.  
NORWOOD, MASS., U. S. A.

To

BURYL STEHMAN BOWDEN

*Whose unfailing courage and faith and loyalty  
are more than great wealth.*



# **CONTENTS**

## **PART ONE**

<b>CONCERNING INDICTMENTS</b>	<b>1</b>
-------------------------------	----------

## **PART TWO**

<b>CIVILIZATION, AMERICAN AND OTHERWISE</b>	<b>15</b>
---	-----------

## **PART THREE**

<b>RELIGION AND CULTURE</b>	<b>55</b>
-----------------------------	-----------

## **PART FOUR**

<b>POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT</b>	<b>91</b>
--------------------------------	-----------

## **PART FIVE**

<b>EDUCATION</b>	<b>127</b>
------------------	------------

## **PART SIX**

<b>ART AND LITERATURE</b>	<b>157</b>
---------------------------	------------

## **PART SEVEN**

<b>SOCIAL INTEGRATION</b>	<b>181</b>
---------------------------	------------

<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>205</b>
---------------------	------------

<b>NOTES AND REFERENCES</b>	<b>209</b>
-----------------------------	------------



•

**PART ONE**

**CONCERNING INDICTMENTS**

•



*It is not hard to be a dreamer, it is not hard to be a booster, it is not hard to be a martyr, devoted leadership is not rare, but to keep a sense of human values in times of great disorder or great success is given to few men large enough of mind and soul to count in history.*

*Henry Seidel Canby.*

## PART ONE

### CONCERNING INDICTMENTS

PAUL VALERY has suggested two great dangers which threaten the world's civilizations—Order and Disorder. It may be assumed that he was not formulating a theory nor building a thesis but merely let fall an afterthought on some theme tinged with pessimism. But one detects in this statement a striking similarity of views expressed by a long list of ruthless but futile modern determinists, American as well as European, who have been affected deeply by the wholesale scepticism of Anatole France, the tragic irony of Hardy, or the drab pessimism of Nietzsche and Oswald Spengler. Some American critics, caught up in this fog bank of gloom and having lost all sense of direction, have joined in singing lustily *The Machine Age Blues*.

Of course one is left quite largely to one's own methods and limitations in arriving at an understanding of what constitutes Order or Disorder, and where such conditions are most pronounced. Is civilization in reality wavering dangerously between one abyss and the other? Perhaps Valery had been toying with political concepts and, noting the mighty chasms which separate profession and performance,

turned his attention to the evils of repressive order in a Czarist Russia or a Fascist Italy, or to caste-ridden India and Oriental peoples deep in old grooves of ancestor worship. Perhaps he had been impressed with raucous disorders in American political campaigns and municipal piracies and gang-infested communities, or with the violent actions and reactions of French and Russian revolutions. But things intellectual received his major attention and while mental America was being slowly pressed down to a dead level of uniformity, moulded into rigid patterns of behavior and thought, stratified into extreme order, in this our machine age, Europe was experiencing an intellectual and moral chaos which was alarming and a rapid revival of its innumerable creeds, dogmas, philosophies, heterogeneous ideals, the three hundred ways of explaining the world, the thousand and one nuances of Christianity, the two dozen positivisms; while the whole spectrum of intellectual light recklessly displayed its incompatible colors, casting a strange contradictory glow on the agony of the European soul. While inventors were feverishly searching their imaginations and the annals of former wars in hope of finding a way to remove barbed wire, strangle the submarine, or paralyze the aeroplane in its flight, the soul, meanwhile, was invoking all its known incantations seeking stability—gravely considering any prophecy, however bizarre; seeking for auguries, refuge, consolations, through the whole gamut of memories, anterior acts and ancestral attitudes. All these are the products of anxiety; they

are the disordered enterprises of the brain which flees from reality to a nightmare and from nightmare to the real, maddened like a rat in a trap.<sup>1</sup>

In short civilization must be looked upon as a victim of one or the other of two mighty cataclysmic forces with vortexes exerting powerful opposing influences, drawing all things irresistibly to one void or the other. There is no middle ground. These centers are fighting each other, approaching each other, and the pull of opposing forces gradually exhausts all energy thereby forcing upon man a desperate but losing fight for existence. "It is," says Philip Gibbs, "some unconscious or semiconscious knowledge—some intuition or foreboding—of this exhaustion of the very sources of energy leading to a desperate struggle for existence in which Empires, States, and people may perish, which is accountable for the wave of melancholy spreading over the western world since the last great war, and expressed poignantly by many of the deepest thinkers in many different nations. They are all 'calamity howlers.' It is a philosophy which strikes to the very roots of social philosophy and pervades the intellectual life of Europe with the spirit of despair. It has found expression in pictorial art which denies beauty; in drama which goes to brutality, cruelty, and vice for its pictures of life; in music which revolts against the charm and melody and rhythm of former ages, and expresses modern life in strange and violent cacophonies; and it is stated starkly by novelists, essayists and philosophers. It is not only an acknowledg-

ment but an assertion that Western civilization has reached its zenith and is on the downward curve, that the end of the industrial era is at hand, that civilization is in the process of decay and is near death. This writing on the wall is in Italian, Spanish, German, French, Danish, English, and many other tongues." <sup>2</sup>

The critic seems to have stepped out of his rôle into that of prophet and in exercising the functions of the prophet has ignored the past and misjudged the present. The picture he sees, therefore, is ill-proportioned and repulsive and his philosophy puerile. Someone invented a robot and straightway the critic saw all America peopled with robots controlled like puppets on a string without in the least knowing or caring from what the movements resulted. Uniformity was the goal and standardization the means. Instead of being educated we have become a nation of print-fed individuals, all reading the same page at the same time and absorbing precisely the same facts. The critic insists upon seeing life as a status quo with never a change in pattern or texture; there is no movement forward. "What he fails to see in the United States is the constant inflow from these civilized groups that keeps down the average of culture, and the equally constant, though less obvious, stream flowing upward, away from the average into better reading, better listening, better thinking. No one has yet devised a test to tell whether the line of our average itself is moving upward or downward." <sup>3</sup>

The critic forgets that there is continuity in cul-

tural change. Instead of seeing life as a rapidly unrolling film with events and scenes as a link in the continuity of all progress he sees only single slides of still life; unrelated scenes without order or sequence.

America cannot be appraised in the light of a single culture-pattern. One skyscraper, one book, one steel mill, or one Teapot Dome scandal cannot classify America. Plato and Aristotle thought in terms of ten thousand homogeneous Greek villagers; America must think in terms of one hundred twenty-five millions of people of every known race and creed and tradition, crossbred, and inbred; influenced by totally strange environments and different climates from those which conditioned their youth. We have to deal with all grades of life from the frontier to the metropolis, from a crude world of country roads and country-town streets, peopled with farmers and tramps and struggling literary clubs; a world of hard-working women and hard-luck men, graft and high ideals, poverty and prosperity, to a world of crowded cities filled with dirty tenements and colossal buildings, of high art and squalid misery, of broad culture and envy and hate, of men who differ in sense of fact, in ideals, in the very groundwork of morals. And we must take into account not the simple opposition and conflict of two classes, but the hostility of many, hostility born of unyielding competition—the farmer, the factory worker, the white-collar professionals, and all the castes within their ranks; the small merchant and the arrogant baron of business. Our problems are complicated by political groups

which foster and factualize organized deception; where truth is poisoned at its source, and the brains of the shrewdest are subsidized to mislead and bewilder a people.

The indictment against Western civilization, with particular emphasis directed at American machine civilization as the enemy of all values, human and divine, is noted for its uniformity in content and its lack of originality and discernment in its method of approach. Although feudal and clerical Europe is being moulded rapidly in the American image, with Japan and other Orientals following a close second, it is America which the critics have singled out as the best illustration of the worst evils they resent.

This literature of despair has risen to flood proportions. It sees every phase, function, and aim of American life, from the research student in our best universities to baby's rattle, wholly standardized. It includes the atrophy of the mind as the seat of rationalism and the hand as a maker and moulder of material. It sees the wide use of syndicated information as a substitute for thinking. It sees modern man as recipient of a more universal leisure and comfort without a corresponding accretion of peace and culture. "It is the especial phase of our time of the eternal struggle between high and low mindedness, but infinitely complicated, since the best things in our civilization—printing, sanitation, free education, and the decline of fear—are dependent upon the same mechanization that produces the chattering salesman whose sum total of activity consists in creating arti-

ficial wants where natural desires have been numbed by standardization and convention." 4

Out of all these frank criticisms and disquieting prophecies may be summed up in brief some generalizations of the gloomy theme which has brought us up sharply to face an indictment and to examine into its merits, as follows:

First. The American soul is pitifully small and undeveloped in comparison with American shrewdness and energy, and instead of being liberated by our material progress it is in fact dying altogether—smothered by our extreme mechanization and standardization of all our functions, individual and collective. A creeping paralysis is spreading over every spiritual impulse.

Second. Ralph Adams Cram voices the belief of many that the day of great leaders is past; that Democracy has achieved its perfect work and has now reduced all mankind to a dead level of incapacity where great leaders are no longer either brought into existence or wanted. We mistrust experts, and society itself is unable of its own power as a whole to lift itself from the nadir of its own uniformity.

Third. High civilization produces racial impoverishment, and one vast night of barbarism is impending. Lothrop Stoddard believes that since our civilization is the most complex the world has seen its burdens are the heaviest ever borne. Presently we shall be crushed beneath the intolerable weight. "Why do we find other races," he asks, "after having attained civilization, losing it and falling back to



lower levels of barbarism and even savagery? Those stagnant or decadent peoples could not bear the burden of civilization."

Fourth. Spengler expounds the cycle theory of history and in scientific terms condemns the America of tomorrow to the sad fate of Tyre and Nineveh. Or, possibly man will revolt and blot the machine forever from his memory and his environment.

Fifth. Count Keyserling finds that in America the individual simply is ceasing to exist; that all development is moving in the direction of standardization; manners and morals are becoming so uniform that we must go to the army corps to find a parallel to them. We have become so regimented that we wear the same clothes; we have no manners; we have no cuisine because we eat canned food; no arts because we see canned drama and listen to canned music. The ideal of the same life, the same emotions for all, is steadily becoming a reality, and intellectual interests as such play hardly any part in the life at large; all values are weighed by their practical application and utilitarian value. The Count even sees this mass-spirit of machine civilization reducing the common man, which includes the entire mass, to the chauffeur type. The chauffeur is the primitive man made technical, and technical endowment is closely related to the savage gift of orientation. The old cultural type and the chauffeur type cannot exist side by side, and since the latter includes the greater majority of people, the former is disappearing altogether.

If this parent stock dies out, then the fine old cultures disappear with it.

Sixth. Religion has become vague and sterile, and having concerned itself primarily with group morals and idealism, has become only a social uplift movement. In short, religion has become the dress coat and cane of the rich man and only a vaulting pole to higher levels of economic favor, when used at all, for the less favored.

Seven. By taking a panoramic view, from some high peak of detachment, of the broad plains and valleys of modern civilization, with ancient cultures in the background, noting the tents of the myriad seekers after the life more abundant encircling us, we get a familiar picture painted for us upon many a recent canvas. We are shown first of all countless multitudes of people on the face of the earth, since the beginning of man's existence, following a slowly rising path toward conscious achievement. Heading the procession are about five per cent of the total who are classed as intellectual superiors. They are the master minds. The followers are the remaining ninety-five per cent who are only mechanically minded. These latter never lead; they follow.

We are told, furthermore, that the accumulated accretions of civilizations of all ages—intellectual, in the arts and sciences, or in the material—from the tomahawk to the radio and the monoplane, are the results of this five per cent of the superior intellectuals, the geniuses, at the top. And if, by some terrible stroke of the fates, all these slowly accumu-

lated results of past and present civilizations should be blotted out of existence and out of the memory of man, including the destruction of the five per cent of the intellectually elite at the top, the remaining ninety-five per cent would revert to savagery without hope of finding a way out, engulfed in one vast night of utter darkness.

In the center of this picture is a huge pyramid. The base is broad but indistinct; the vertex is clear and vivid in the sunlight. The apex is composed of that five per cent of leaders; the base is that multitude of miserable wretches who have ever been the bearers of burdens. The achievements of those at the top are ever increasing and piling the burdens always heavier upon the underlings for them alone to support. Inexorable as the fates are the facts which tell us that the top five per cent forming the capstone are not reproducing themselves and will soon disappear. The elements of initiative in society are being sapped. The pyramid, therefore, deprived of the elements of rigidity enforced by the standards of the leaders, will crumple under the enormous weight. The base will broaden and presently there sprawls the shapeless mass without beauty and grace. It is all very discouraging.

We are anxious to know whether that is a picture of reality or merely a trick of mental photography. Perhaps we are only wilderness children peeking behind the screen of the picture man to learn the secret of his magic. But all in all, whatever the bent of its probing, seldom has there been so great an anxiety

to know what the future holds for any civilization as that of the present. We seek an augury of tomorrow.

Let us, therefore, strike a balance of values, ever alert to distinguish the false simulating truth.



•

PART TWO

CIVILIZATION, AMERICAN AND OTHERWISE

•

*My notion is that a Sense of Values and Reason enthroned are the parent qualities of high civilization and that the search for characteristics will resolve itself into a search for their characteristics.*

*Clive Bell.*

## PART TWO

### CIVILIZATION, AMERICAN AND OTHERWISE

#### I

THE civilization of any race is judged by the manner in which it has adjusted itself to its environment. In any consideration and discussion of civilization, as distinguished from culture, we are at once in danger of descending to mere platitudes about progress, advance, gain, reform, improvement, decline, impoverishment, and so on. We are disposed also to confine ourselves to geographical lines or chronological divisions. All these, however, have a definite place and value, and merit careful consideration in searching out characteristics. There is a very real sense of demarcation between Ancient, Medieval, and Modern, as well as between Oriental and Occidental, Teutonic and Nordic, and a careful student might block out any of the divisions mentioned and delineate its characteristics, and to good purpose, or he might turn his attention to other divisions, but for our present task it must suffice to consider modern civilization as that which has grown out of the forces and influences which produced the industrial revolution, and as that mighty stream of ideas and forces flowing out of



Europe these three centuries and spreading over a greater part of the world. When we speak of modern civilization we refer to that of Western Europe and America. This civilization has its roots in ancient peoples and conditions and has drawn the sustenance of its growth from many sources, ancient and medieval, but it is marked by many new forces and conditions quite distinct from and unknown to medieval or ancient life. Though Western in origin, modern civilization is taking hold of the entire world without regard for locality or race, and by its political and commercial aggression, its arts and its sciences, its social and industrial organizations, its customs, amusements, clothes, and modern mechanical equipment, it is penetrating and displacing other and older civilizations.

Whether this phase of modern civilization is preferable to an older order of things does not for the moment concern us; the merits of it will be considered later, but the important fact remains that the modern regime is by sheer force of its impact changing the social complexion of Europe and Asia. As age-old grooves are suddenly obliterated and replaced by the strange and the new, resentment flares up and dark prophecies are born which envision Frankenstein coming ponderously around some corner bent on destroying his master.

It may be suggested as significant that it is precisely from those seats of older and rooted civilizations, encrusted in tradition and well-defined culture-patterns, that come our first warnings of catastrophe.

The impact of new forces has created alarm and met resistance. America, being without such a background of habits and traditions, has offered little or no resistance to what some are pleased to call a menace. To those of deep understanding this new Western civilization offers no menace; it only sets up a challenge. Fear is the master of routines. Dire forebodings and warnings have become vocal among those who are creatures of older routines and admirers of them; those without understanding of the full implication of the old and the promise of the new.

The pertinent fact in all this concern about modern civilization is that it centers about individual man and his welfare while giving the impression of ignoring him altogether. Critics lift their voices in warning of the danger which they see in the ever increasing emphasis upon material things of a mechanistic or technological civilization. They see man becoming so absorbed and infatuated with his machines and his institutions that he is rapidly becoming a slave to the things he worships. He is no longer master but mastered, and his characteristics more and more resemble those of his master, the machine. In the near future man will become so dwarfed by his machines that he will be crushed by them.

These gloomy prophecies of the social philosopher and the predilections of the critic leave me singularly cold and unmoved. If Lothrop Stoddard sees modern civilization becoming a burden too heavy to be borne, it may be suggested with some propriety that

Europe these three centuries and spreading over a greater part of the world. When we speak of modern civilization we refer to that of Western Europe and America. This civilization has its roots in ancient peoples and conditions and has drawn the sustenance of its growth from many sources, ancient and medieval, but it is marked by many new forces and conditions quite distinct from and unknown to medieval or ancient life. Though Western in origin, modern civilization is taking hold of the entire world without regard for locality or race, and by its political and commercial aggression, its arts and its sciences, its social and industrial organizations, its customs, amusements, clothes, and modern mechanical equipment, it is penetrating and displacing other and older civilizations.

Whether this phase of modern civilization is preferable to an older order of things does not for the moment concern us; the merits of it will be considered later, but the important fact remains that the modern regime is by sheer force of its impact changing the social complexion of Europe and Asia. As age-old grooves are suddenly obliterated and replaced by the strange and the new, resentment flares up and dark prophecies are born which envision Frankenstein coming ponderously around some corner bent on destroying his master.

It may be suggested as significant that it is precisely from those seats of older and rooted civilizations, encrusted in tradition and well-defined culture-patterns, that come our first warnings of catastrophe.

The impact of new forces has created alarm and met resistance. America, being without such a background of habits and traditions, has offered little or no resistance to what some are pleased to call a menace. To those of deep understanding this new Western civilization offers no menace; it only sets up a challenge. Fear is the master of routines. Dire forebodings and warnings have become vocal among those who are creatures of older routines and admirers of them; those without understanding of the full implication of the old and the promise of the new.

The pertinent fact in all this concern about modern civilization is that it centers about individual man and his welfare while giving the impression of ignoring him altogether. Critics lift their voices in warning of the danger which they see in the ever increasing emphasis upon material things of a mechanistic or technological civilization. They see man becoming so absorbed and infatuated with his machines and his institutions that he is rapidly becoming a slave to the things he worships. He is no longer master but mastered, and his characteristics more and more resemble those of his master, the machine. In the near future man will become so dwarfed by his machines that he will be crushed by them.

These gloomy prophecies of the social philosopher and the predilections of the critic leave me singularly cold and unmoved. If Lothrop Stoddard sees modern civilization becoming a burden too heavy to be borne, it may be suggested with some propriety that

perhaps he was one of the blind men who went to see an elephant, and grasping the animal's tail proclaimed with loud emphasis that the largest of all animals was exactly like a rope. Just precisely how much of a burden is modern civilization? A burden is defined as something oppressive, and modern civilization is supposed to lift oppressions wherever they appear. The progress of civilization is marked by the struggles of society to free itself from limitations. Many individuals get altogether an erroneous conception of what freedom from limitations really means. We are constantly reminded of this triteness by the prattle of the demagogue about personal liberty or freedom of speech. A handful of springs, wheels, and screws thrown on the table do not constitute so many free units; they are powerless in the grip of all sorts of limitations of impotence. Let some master assemble the parts and adjust them in proper articulation and one has a watch which is valuable because there is perfect freedom of movement for each part in the place for which it was designed. The chaotic limitations on the wheels and springs and screws have given way to ordered adjustment. Modern civilization is geared to a like balance. Are we more burdened because we prevent disease by sanitation and scientific methods instead of by incantations of the ancient medicine men? Is it more of a burden to eliminate famine by mass production and distribution of foods than by placating the rain gods? Were the early struggling civilizations that had to build walls around their cities to keep out

marauding tribes of barbarians less burdened than are the inhabitants of Main Street? Feudal lords of four and five centuries ago were especially free from the burdens we endure; they roamed in their hunts without restraint. No production schedule held them chained to a desk; no keep-off-the-grass sign told them where not to go; no private property with fences bearing signs, "No hunting allowed," challenged his pleasure. But what of the poverty-crushed vassals whose crops and gardens were overrun and destroyed with impunity by these same masters of the chase and lords of the castle?

Consider that terrible form of human slavery endured by the 'ricksha coolie in China! These human beasts of burden, the foundation of China's local transportation system, who run and sweat and toil with no limit to their hours of labor, break their bodies completely in a few years. They enjoy the blessed freedom from standardization which Western peoples have to endure; and they are not regimented and mechanized, but their work, which fetches only a few cents a day, is so terrible that the average life of the stoutest among them is only six to nine years. They are wrecked and deformed before the age of thirty—then sink into human refuse. Compare them with the American workman who rides to work in his own motor car, works short hours at good wages, and has within his reach the best art and music available. Are the Chinese less burdened? In India their time-honored religion has segregated various groups into castes, some into outcastes, the members of which

cannot approach within a prescribed number of yards of members of another caste. Measured by our standards, their civilization is more primitive than ours, but is it less burdensome?

"During the past half-century a phenomenal thing has happened in the conditions of human life," says C. E. A. Winslow. "Over one-third of the total burden of disease and early death has been lifted from its shoulders; and this is the result of modern science, applied directly to the problems of public health, and in part, of chemical and physical and mechanical and industrial sciences which have operated directly by raising standards of living throughout the civilized world." <sup>5</sup>

Spengler believes that a time may come when man, tiring of all this artificial life built around mechanical power, will "blot the machine from his memory and his environment and create about himself a wholly new environment, in which nothing of this devil's technique is left." He seems to have forgotten that man once lived in such an age and environment but blotted out the machineless age by inventing machinery to substitute for human labor. In fact the first act of primitive man upon emerging from his cave was to construct rough implements with which to subdue the enemies about him. The memory of man hardly extends far enough into the past to encompass the age when man had no machine.

The Greeks and the Romans attained a high degree of culture and civilization but they were not an inventive people; they slowed down the progress

toward a machine age. They did not need to invent labor-saving devices; slaves did all the labor. They were great builders, yet they despised the man who performed any kind of labor. Slaves did the work in times of peace and the fighting and dying in times of war. They furnished the power for the then powerful navies; the labor for building roads, canals and monuments. Greece at the height of her power in geographical terms, boasted four or five millions of freemen and thirteen million slaves. There were instances of individual cities in which slaves outnumbered the freemen six to one. Rome, in one generation, built by means of slave labor water works covering more than three hundred miles in length, and commercial and military highways in excess of fifty thousand miles in length. The few at the top of the pile had no need of machines; slave life and labor kept them at the top in leisure that they might develop culture. But that same culture taught the man at the top of the pile to despise the miserable wretches at the bottom who supported his vaunted civilization. There has always been a widespread disdain for the rough man of toil and a belief, born of desire, that he could never have a part in any possible contribution to culture or civilization; that was reserved for the man at the top of the pyramid. But the masses at the bottom have gradually advanced to higher levels until today his favorable position partly accounts for the pessimism of those higher up who have watched with envy that rising level.

The Roman or Greek politician is better known to



us than the engineers who designed the bridges or the architects who built the parthenons and amphitheaters, or, with few exceptions, the supreme artists in either country. They, too, were laborers, too vulgar to be classed with the best.

Something of the old prejudice against the man who labors seems to be noticeable in a recent criticism of America by one of the leading French minds. He understands America as few foreigners do. In adjuring his countrymen not "to become too American," he said: "America—and it is without doubt her best contribution to civilization—has created a higher standard of living. . . . However, there is one thing one can obtain only at a prohibitive price, and sometimes one cannot obtain it at all, that is the service of another human being. . . . There are many houses of well-to-do citizens who possess two automobiles, where there is no cook and frequently no servants; where the wife cooks, the husband polishes his own shoes, and the children make the beds. . . ." <sup>6</sup>

## II

What we are in danger of forgetting is that this Western civilization which has its center of gravity in the United States has flourished without the guiding hand of tradition and without the restrictions of an established social order. The primary elements of American civilization are the products of an older culture type; people conditioned in a static environ-

ment, which they pronounced a failure, threw it overboard after having rebelled against it, and began to build after new patterns. The problems inherent in this departure into new paths in the struggle to define new objectives have been at times well-nigh overwhelming. The objectives are not wholly new but the methods of approach are.

These rebels of a decaying and tyrannical civilization, the Puritans and the Pilgrims, found free land in a new and virgin country. It is fortunate that this was so, for only did they find freedom at the beginning of their struggle. Had they been renters or serfs, had they held land by the grace of a landed aristocracy or seized it as a result of a revolt against that aristocracy, they could not have laid the foundations of an entirely new civilization based upon a new set of human values. Those fine folk who came with their sublime faith and unparalleled courage to the rockbound coasts of New England; who faced the cruelties of winter in a new world, began another epoch, not where the old one left off, but much in advance of it. The strength with which they drove the stakes of homestead, church, and school into reluctant soil has not passed from us. It remains as the saving element against our being baffled in face of increasing complexities of a highly technical civilization which is being criticised from every quarter of the earth. This criticism is the resultant not so much of antagonism as of misunderstanding.

If every epoch is the death of a dream or a new dream coming to birth, it might be added with equal

assurance that every new epoch is a child of the old and has many characteristics of it. If the Machine Age is considered a distinct epoch in the development of cultures and civilizations it is but the outgrowth of an earlier epoch, the industrial revolution, which in turn was nourished by decaying feudalism. But through all these succeeding epochs, from Eden to Calvary, to Valley Forge, to the Kellogg-Briand treaty, one ruling passion has dominated common man—the desire for freedom. All religion is based on this yearning for freedom, security, assurance of an ideal state of the soul; all literature, art, music, is dominated by its ideal. The furtherest reaches into antiquity reveal seething masses in which the individual, though indistinguishable, was striving to step up a little higher from the talus-cluttered base of the pyramid toward some vague ideal but dimly understood—and never reaching it. Today the same struggle is as tense as ever. Modern man is oppressed by the weight of his civilization; ancient man by the lack of it. One critic thinks we are approaching a state of hysteria and panic in our attempt “to escape the deadly anonymity of modern life, and the prime cause is not the vanity of our writers but the craving—I had almost said terror—of the general man who feels his own personality sinking lower into a whirl of indistinguishable atoms to be lost in a mass of civilization.”

Freedom is only relative. One of the fatal misconceptions of the oppressed is that the oppressor is free. Consequently when they themselves get free-

dom, so believes one student,<sup>8</sup> they are inclined to imitate their former oppressors. In their bitter suffering and experience under oppression, they have learned to classify all persons under two groups—oppressed and oppressor. They have named the oppressed slaves and the unoppressed free men. One thing they have failed to learn; both are equally enslaved.

Thus, it is reasoned, when nations like the United States gain their freedom as independent organizations, they desire, with true missionary zeal, to extend that freedom to all their citizens, but in reality—and this bears a close resemblance to Puritanism—they remove one oppression and add many. The newly freed thus practice newer methods of oppression by accumulating wealth, organizing cliques, parties, secret societies, service clubs, uplift groups, banks, newspapers, propagandists, promoters, and the like. The average man is indeed touched by a thousand new influences, new and strange forces, each one of which weighs but lightly upon him, but when all put together they weigh heavily upon him. This perhaps accounts for the belief held by some critics that the greater and more advanced the civilization the heavier the burden it imposes. It may be true, however, that the pull of many of these forces is upward rather than downward.

America's honeymoon with a virgin continent has ended and now follows a period of adjustment to more prosaic living and routine labors. There were no servants in the home of the newly weds, so they cre-

ated a new type of servant; they substituted machine-power for man-power, and during the past century and a half, says Philip Gibbs,<sup>9</sup> the engineer and the scientist have altered the whole complexion of the Western world. They have created the actions and reactions between "great groups of humanity, and changed the conditions of life for the individual man by putting new power into his hands. . . . The results of their experiments have substituted machine-power for man-power. It created the industrial era with its teeming cities and smoke-belching factories. It annihilated almost completely in certain countries, the slow methods of the handicraft, the slow old ways of human labor. It speeded up the rhythm of life."

Civilization realizes its progress mainly in two directions—through the emotions, or feelings, and reason. Some students believe that exaltation of reason is fatal to the emotions and that instinctive emotions must play the major rôle in the growth of culture. Quite the reverse is true. Civilization comes with the enthronement of reason, while culture is the child of civilization and must be disciplined by it. The ascendancy of the instincts and the emotions over reason is fatal to the latter. Art is the expression of the emotions; science the expression of reason. While it is true that high art and broad culture must depend on a correspondingly high civilization, no civilization dies childless, that is, without its art and culture. The children may be puny, and many times are, depending upon the vitality of the parents, but

they must be taken into consideration in any attempt to appraise the whole field of advance. Every great period in the world's history, therefore, is marked by a notable appreciation of aesthetics and an advance in knowledge.<sup>10</sup> To this general rule the sixteenth century was no exception, for it was distinguished not only by a wonderful development in architecture, sculpture, painting, engraving, music, and literature, but is the logical starting point of our modern ideas of natural and experimental science.

In fact, we moderns believe so thoroughly in science as at once the legitimate means and the proper goal of race progress that we fill our school curriculums with scientific studies. This spirit is essentially modern; it owes its chief stimulus to notable achievements in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For this high valuation placed upon science in American civilization we are the objects of sharp criticisms. Such words as materialistic, uniformity, specialization, technological, conformity, mechanistic, regimentation, standardization, stratification, Puritanism, *ad infinitum*, are intoned day in and day out in a voice of death and in a manner of despair, as if the words themselves suggest something dangerous and sinister, till the weak amongst us cringe and hoist a flag of complete surrender. The intelligent American, however, faces them with no fear in his heart; glad to acknowledge their special import and willing to defend them against all implications of evil. He asks only the right to interpret them.

The older European civilization did not cross the Atlantic only to flower more luxuriantly in virgin soil, for the new society in the United States is not merely another Renaissance; it is the creation of new conceptions. We may agree with Andre Siegfried that "the chief contrast between Europe and America is not so much one of geography as a fundamental difference between two epochs in the history of mankind, each with its own conception of life," but we are a bit skeptical about his assertion that "even the humblest European sees in art an aristocratic symbol of his own personality, and Modern America has no national art and does not even feel the need of one." History offers no parallel of social forces converging on so vast and so intensive a scale; a scale at once forbidding and challenging, but even the extent of the created wealth is no wise comparable to the dynamic force of human impulse that has brought this wealth into being. Nor is there anything to compare with the tremendous social forces at work making for a juster distribution of this wealth for the common good. These forces are such that they cannot be made to function in the patterns of older culture-types, and the latter—if they ever existed to a notable degree in America—are rapidly disappearing. Unlike Europe, we are not trying to copy these older cultures, nor are we trying to resuscitate them, but are content to revere them as dead and to build on new conceptions. Merely because ours is a new order does not argue that it is inferior or lacking in possibilities.

## III

The fact of civilization, of simple group living, implies standardization. It always has; it always will. Standards themselves change, but standardization remains a perpetual element of all societies, thinks Stuart Chase.<sup>11</sup> There is nothing, therefore, in the word itself to alarm us. The machine has helped to cast the present mould of machine-age culture, but it did not create the phenomenon. Nor does the machine impose such rigid standards as those imposed by ancestor worship in China; the church in Medieval Europe; the caste system of India; the state socialism of the Incas in ancient Peru, and by countless other agents. Standardization is more truly a liberator than an agent of slavery. It relegates individual problems to the field of routine and leaves creative faculties for the larger problems of culture and growth.

No trend in history is more discernible and constant than that each succeeding civilization is less regimented and standardized than its predecessor. The story of Persia, Greece, Rome, Egypt, China, Japan, is much the same in their corresponding stages—rigid enforcement of standardized worship, unbreakable caste divisions, cruelties unspeakable practiced by each group on the next lower inferior strata. Ross tells us that “King Hammurabi ruled a group of city provinces in process of unification through the influence of a nationalized religion, a powerful centralized government, a closely interdependent



commerce, and a well-recognized legal system which protected property rights and stimulated agriculture and industry. The state was personified in the priest-king, in whom were joined personal prestige and personal divine authority. Crown lands were held under feudal tenure by a class of priests, devotees, nobles, military and civil officials, in whose interests the laws were in certain respects carefully framed. To presumably the same social status belonged a class of land owners, bankers, and merchants. Next in the social scale came the tradesmen and artisans, followed by the tenant farmers who held their lands under the metayer system. In the next stratum were the free wage-earners; while last of all came a great body of house and other slaves upon whose labor the entire economic structure was largely based. . . .

"Babylonian society was pyramidal. The king was the apex, and the broad base rested upon a foundation of slaves. Social control was mediated from class to class. Caste and status were embedded in the code. In precise tariffs human values were set forth." <sup>12</sup>

In the later Roman Empire the caste system, built up by forces from within rather than from conquests of inferior peoples, was possibly more pronounced than that of the Babylonians. Samuel Dill says: "An almost Oriental system of caste has made every social grade and every occupation practically hereditary, from the senator to the waterman on the Tiber, or the sentinel at a frontier post. In a society where poverty is almost branded with infamy poverty is

steadily increasing and wealth becoming more aggressive and insolent. The middle or bourgeoisie class was almost extinguished. Rome's financial system was almost paralyzed, and at its close the real victors and survivors were the great landholders, surrounded by their serfs and dependents. . . .

"The tendency of the later Empire was to stereotype society by compelling men to follow the occupations of their fathers, and preventing a free circulation among different callings and grades of life. The man who brought the grain from Africa to the public stores of Ostia, the baker who made it into loaves for distribution, the butcher who brought pigs from Samnium, Lucannia or Brutium, the purveyors of wine and oil, the men who fed the furnaces of the public baths, were bound to their callings from one generation to another. It was the principle of rural serfdom applied to social functions. Every avenue of escape was closed. A man was bound to his calling not only by his father's but by his mother's condition. Men were not permitted to marry out of their guild. If a daughter of one of the baker caste married a man not belonging to it, her husband was bound to her father's calling. Not even a dispensation obtained by some means from the imperial chancery, not even the power of the church could avail to break the bond of servitude." <sup>13</sup>

Regimentation is always and constantly a social fact in every civilization; one cannot escape it. There are standard units of time, length, temperature; standard sizes for screws, bolts, nuts, legal docu-

ments, printed pages; standards for weights and measures, bricks, concrete blocks; standardized methods for erecting skyscrapers, typewriters, bridges, flagpoles, gas masks, airplanes, and cuff buttons. Housewives of any given age or place make bread in pretty much the same fashion out of the same ingredients, and serve it about the same time each day. Today American wives purchase uniform loaves of bread made uniformly by machinery and pay the same amount of money for the same size loaf whether in Minneapolis or Memphis. But what of it? Standards change but standardization is ever present, whether it manifests itself in a uniform manner of making tomahawks by the aboriginee or the making of a million pairs of shoes by a St. Louis factory. Has this change in method necessarily had a benumbing effect on the individual or the American collective soul? Raymond Fosdick thinks it has and paints a somber picture for us: "The material side of life in America is fast developing a sameness, a uniformity, a monotony without parallel in history over so wide an area. Quantity production, advertising, and the new methods of communication and transportation which modern machinery has created are breaking down the differences which hitherto have made civilization a garment of many colors." <sup>14</sup>

True, new methods in transportation have been developed which may be less colorful, particularly in retrospection, than the 'ricksha coolie system or the ox team of the pioneer, but its total effect on culture and morals may be a matter of some speculation.

The Pony Express was a link in the communication over wide areas on the American continent, and the hard-riding figure across lonely sections of wild country—mountains, plains, forests, rivers—is the center of a colorful and romantic picture; so is the airmail pilot. It is doubtful, though, if the lonely rider who extracted the utmost of animal endurance from his faithful steed and left it, at the end of a few months, a wreck sacrificed to the killing pace demanded in the name of speed, was more exalted in spirit or enriched in mind than the pilot of a modern mail plane who lifts himself from the ground at sunset and by breakfast has delivered his pouch of mail a thousand miles distant. Nor are those served by the latter method more adversely effected than those served by the former; both were served equally well and satisfactorily in relation to the conditions of his time; each a victim alike of uniformity of service.

The history of transportation furnishes many colorful stages of development, but none more striking—to the gentle reader in his cloistered den—than the long caravans of plodding beasts across desert wastes, frequently leaving the bones of beast and master to bleach in sand and sun. That picture may be preferred on æsthetic grounds to the roaring express that laps up space in its monotonous plunge across a continent, but no one to my knowledge has produced any proofs or precise reasons why the former method of transportation should be classed as less monotonous or more conducive to high art and culture than the latter. And it may be questioned whether the

traveler, bent on business or pleasure, seated in a picturesque howdah and swaying bumpily for hours on the back of a ponderous elephant, was more benefited by his colorful jaunt than he who bowls along countrysides in a high-powered automobile built in Detroit.

We may consider further one of the many indictments of Mr. Fosdick. "Toward this goal of standardization modern industrial methods are driving with determination. Standardization has indeed become one of the bulwarks of our economic life. It has been carried into every branch of industry. In the interest of economy we have standardized the size of bricks and blackboards and blankets. We have standardized sizes and types of beds and mattresses and hotel chinaware. We have standardized bolts and nuts and milk bottles and bed springs. The Department of Commerce is engaged in an effort to hasten the pace and widen the approach toward standardization, and committees and commissions, specially formed for that purpose, are now at work. Standardization is in the air. It even extends to standard divorce laws, and standardized building and plumbing codes. . . . The Ford machine in Detroit and elsewhere stamps out more than two millions of automobiles a year, more than six thousand a day, but within their types there is no difference between them. . . ." <sup>15</sup>

Again we ask in all sincerity: what of it? A little reflection will remove the sting implied in these various dark prophecies and indictments. Aren't stand-

ard marriage and divorce laws rather to be desired than despised? Where is the merit to be found in a multiplicity of styles and sizes of milk bottles, or nuts, or bedsprings? Because the Ford factories turn out more than six thousand automobiles a day, all exactly alike, does it necessarily follow that the individual machine is inferior merely because it is exactly like two million other automobiles? Is the man who owns one adversely affected because his neighbor has one exactly like his own. Is the man who stands all day facing a power-driven machine or who screws on one nut as his only contribution to the finished product in any manner degraded or more benumbed in spirit and mind than the same man was when he hoed three thousand hills of tobacco in one day, each plant requiring the same number of strokes of a heavy hoe delivered in the same body-breaking fashion? Or digging potatoes? Or breaking hemp? Or gathering grapes? Or husking corn? Each type of work is repetitive and very monotonous and requires a highly standardized technic; what type of labor does not? And all these occupations, primitive or modern, require tools. Man is inherently a tool-using animal; his first step away from his cave was to create a tool to help him master his environment. Our modern tools are bigger and better and more powerful, and more universally used than in any previous age, and while man's brain capacity may not have increased at all over his Cro-Magnon ancestor of twenty thousand years ago, his powers of application have increased enormously. To the asser-

tion that the accumulation of technical knowledge has not been accompanied by a proportionate increase in intelligence it may be replied that man's achievements in a technical way are only now beginning to catch up with his intelligence.

The fact of confronting a rotary press or an assembly line or a high-power machine may mean exaltation and delight even as it may mean degradation. Henry Ford tells us that much of the factory work must of necessity be repetitive, otherwise it would be impossible to gain the effortless speed which makes low prices and high wages a reality. Some tasks are exceedingly monotonous, but then, also, many minds are monotonous—they want to earn a living without thinking, and for these men tasks which demand no brains are a boon.

Stuart Chase finds<sup>16</sup> that the total number of factory workers in the United States in 1929, were 7,927,000 not including officials. Other trades not classed as factories but requiring skilled machine technic, run the total to 10,165,000. Fully half this number are not machine tenders at all, but have some sort of executive, clerical and other work with varying degrees of variety, leaving approximately 5,000,000 workers who might be classed as robots. It is this group of workers, each possessing a few highly specialized skills which has furnished much material for dark prophecies of despair, but that much of this fear, even of a small number of our population being adversely effected as a result of this machine age is groundless. According to Fred Col-

vin, "Most people do not want to express themselves, and are much happier with someone else taking responsibility. The stolid look is a generic one. Such men are built stolid; they would be stolid on a farm." It is sheer nonsense to blame the machine or the machine-age for the brutalization of anyone; common honesty in the presence of all the facts leads one to the opposite conclusion.

For real brutalization of the common man one only has to glance at Great Britain in the early part of the eighteenth century when more than half of the total population was submerged in debt, misery, virtual serfdom, scourged by laws promoted by the upper classes for the purpose of keeping the majority submerged. The country was filled with paupers maintained by the taxes;<sup>17</sup> poor people sent to jail or shut up in workhouses while their children of tender years were carted off to factories to help pay the debts of the father who was already imprisoned for debt. Sailors were kidnapped for the royal navy at so much per head (the reader will recall that this practice was one of the contributing factors leading to the War of 1812); the farm hand was bound to the farm like a serf; more than two hundred petty offenses were punishable by death—this applied with peculiar relevancy to the submerged majority, anyone of whom might be beheaded legally for cutting down a tree for firewood or stealing a shilling to buy bread. Quakers were imprisoned systematically and Roman Catholics debarred from office.

In Japan a half-century ago "regimentation of so-



ciety resembled that of all antique civilizations," says Ross. "The household ruled the person; the five-family group, the household; the community, the group; the lord of the soil, the community; the Shogun, the lord. . . . Laws not only regulated the size of one's dwelling, and the cost of its furniture, but even the substance and character of clothing—not only the expense of a wedding outfit, but the quality of the marriage feast and the quality of the food that was to be served. . . . Rules innumerable decided exactly what should be said—the word to be chosen, the phrase to be used. Personality was wholly suppressed by coercion and coercion was chiefly from within, not from without—the life of every individual being so ordered by the will of the rest as to render free action, free speaking, or free thinking out of the question."<sup>18</sup> Instances may be multiplied beyond necessity proving that modern civilization is becoming daily less standardized as well as less repressed and burdensome.

According to Gulick, "There is a marked increase in vivacity in those Japanese who become Christians. The repressive social restraints of the old social order are somewhat removed. A freedom is allowed the individuals of the Christian community, in social life, in conversation between men and women, in the holding of public opinions, which the non-Christian order of society did not present. Sociability between the sexes was not allowed. The new freedom quite naturally results in greater vivacity and a far freer

play of facial expression than the older order could produce."

American life is not standardized despite many alarming tendencies.<sup>19</sup> We are entering that stage of centralization, intellectually speaking, which Europe passed through in the eighteenth century, only on a much vaster scale. We have a diverse population which is constantly in flux; from south to north; from the farm to the city; from north to south to west. In ten years, from 1920 to 1930, a million farmers with their families moved to the cities. Urban centers are growing and the variety of occupations is ever on the increase. The Lynds found in a typical city, population about thirty-eight thousand inhabitants, more than four hundred occupations open to anyone on the merit basis, male or female, depending on the possession of certain skills. The public is making possible for everyone to become skilled at little or no expense to the individual, therefore throwing open those four hundred occupations on equal terms to every American regardless of age, race, or condition. Compare this with a typical medieval city in which one was born, lived, and died; where no one ever left his class, being by tradition and law compelled to follow the trade of his father, and at best there were fewer than a dozen occupations open to him.

In reading the current literature about America we are in danger of thinking that we are uniformly prosperous, progressive, alert, and educated. Lewis F. Carr<sup>20</sup> has called attention to the thousands of

Mrs. Cagles to be found in many backward sections of this country. Mrs. Cagle, a character in a recent play, 'Sun Up,' was a woman of the Southern Appalachians. She was essentially a seventeenth century person, though living in the twentieth. Her conceptions of life and her speech were archaic. The law was something that killed her men-folks or deprived them of their lawful means of a livelihood—moonshining. The greatest distance she could imagine was "forty miles beyond Asheville." All enemies were Yankees, and anyone who came from further than ten miles of her cabin was a 'furriner.' To the urbanite it may be a surprise that there are more than a half-million such women in the hinterlands of the United States—poor, ignorant, native-born white women, thin and wrinkled in youth from ill-prepared food, clad without warmth or grace, living in untidy houses, working from daylight to bedtime, mothers of joyless children, worn out with excessive childbearing, and encrusted with a shell of dull content.

A passing acquaintance with a typical rural American family of the kind mentioned above, or any of the variations of that type, will reveal a surprising amount of well-established uniformity in thought, actions, ideals, and moral standards, of which factory-produced furniture and other necessities may as readily be effect as cause. Mass production of shoes and hats and watches and automobiles do not prove a case either for or against standardization. After all, the human anatomy conforms pretty definitely to a

standard pattern; all human feet are much alike and it should occasion no surprise that we build shoes and stockings after a uniform standard. Many early civilizations adopted brightly colored costumes—cloaks of many colors—but their inner lives were uniformly drab and colorless and hedged about to a much greater degree than later generations, more particularly of the present. More people now dress alike, look alike, and act alike than they did a century ago, but that is due in the main to dissolving caste and class distinctions. Caste no longer whips them into different groups with unyielding class uniformity such as the coolie or medieval villein.

The individual craftsman has passed but the machine-made product which supplanted his is much above the best the craftsman had to offer. His trained hand and eye, at best, were bungling instruments where measurements demand accuracy to a thousandth of an inch. We have become essentially machine-minded and therefore less and less dazzled by them; we see them as instruments instead of curiosities.

There have been many slumps in the field of art, culture, liberal learning, and religion in the past long sweep of history, but the contributing causes of these periods of decadence in every instance are noticeably absent from contemporary life in the United States. If art and culture are headed for another slump, machinery may be a contributing factor; it will not be the cause. "Business is not a builder of culture; though its profits have provided

cultivation for multitudes, in museums, schools, and other opportunities for education and for emotional stimulation."

It is significant that each succeeding step in any given civilization has seen common man shedding his shackles one by one; now he stands before kings. Once nearly two-thirds of the civilized world was held in physical slavery by the remaining one-third. Actual suffering from the lash, disease, cruelties of every sort, mental and physical, was the rule. Each succeeding generation has lifted a share of the load till today there is scarcely a place in any civilized nation where slavery exists. The man lowest down in the scale may still have that stolid expression and be dumb to impressions of higher culture, but he is no longer a chattel.

#### IV

We live in a world of events which determine our destiny; in a world of rapidly changing values without an adequate measuring unit; in a revolutionary period, and nothing is so important as to be aware of it. To evaluate American civilization and culture without a sense of this kaleidoscopic change of pace and scene and racial traits is fatal to truth. American civilization may be assessed more properly in terms of promise and hope; in its reserve power and potentialities than in actual accomplishments. It cannot be judged as a *status quo* nor as a *fait accompli*; rather as a stream which frequently changes

its movement and its course, from obscure sources in wild regions to broader plains and valleys of untold resources.

Every great civilization in the past has rested on a basis of material well-being. Most of them have attained that condition of material prosperity at the expense of other peoples, that is, through an imperialistic policy of conquest of other peoples by superior power of arms, or by ruthless exploitation of their own nationals. If riches seized from others could build a temple at Athens, a coliseum at Rome, or a palace at Versailles, it was all for the glory of the state, that is, for the hereditary ruling class at the top. It mattered not at all if millions in the lower strata died in the process, for they existed solely for the glory of the state. "All civilizations of which I have heard," says Bell,<sup>21</sup> "have been imposed either by the will of a tyrant or maintained by an oligarchy."

America's course is set in the opposite direction—the state exists for the individual. If in our democracy of today, which Wells defines as a transitory confusion, the simple citizen not only has been set free but can surround himself with comforts and luxuries to a degree hitherto unknown, this can be set down as a distinct gain which our machine civilization has made possible, for it has amplified his life, widened his horizon, increased life's resources, and released time for leisure.

We occupy a country extremely varied in climate and contour, and made up of diverse peoples. The typical American is beyond classification unless we

take that broadly homogeneous population in the Middle West which occupies, roughly speaking, that immensely fertile country between the Alleghanies and the Rockies. This prairie country has been the center of progressivism in politics, popular education, pacifism, kindly good-will, evangelical Christianity, and has always been quickly responsive to appeals for the square deal and more nearly equal opportunities for the masses. This section at times appears to ignore the rest of the world, lives its own life, fills its huge granaries throughout the grain belt from Kansas and Indiana to the Canadian border, mans its giant mills and factories in the Great Lakes region, its cotton fields in the South, maintains its own moral and social standards, and is keenly alive to the welfare of its own people. It is not much concerned about the family tree.

In the Atlantic states, that narrow strip of land east of the Alleghanies, one finds a people more cosmopolitan, more blase, more alive to world politics and commerce; it looks out upon Europe and the Past. New England, the early home of Protestantism in America, has somewhat softened the asperities of its church code, but still is the bulwark of conservative Puritanism. The differences that once marked the colonists in the Tidewater region from those of the Plymouth region have for the most part disappeared, and both alike have been changed by more active contacts with the immigrant.

West of the Rockies America looks in the opposite direction—toward the Orient whence comes many of

the racial problems which it fears. Wealth is gravitating toward the Pacific West and Northwest, and by the development of its own resources a new culture is rapidly emerging, a culture as typically American as the Middle West and as interested in world problems as the East, as friendly as was the Old South, and as radical as the prairie grain belt toward the north—with all, truly American.

At the north of us lives a friendly neighbor separated from us by only a geographical line without a fort, while to the south lives a people of another race and tradition, also beyond an unprotected border, yet for the welfare of both of us must remain our friends. Our "plains and mountains hold on their surface and in their depths untold wealth to which Alaska will contribute enormously; of a climate which enables men to think and work at their best; with over one hundred millions of people with a deep and broad foundation of Anglo-Saxon tradition and law, now mingled with peoples of other races and nations, thus tempering the stock with untold possibilities of culture and power. A restriction on immigration is solidifying our people and enabling us to forecast the proportion of races." <sup>22</sup>

Protected thus by natural barriers from aggressive enemies, America is unrivalled in position and wealth by any other of the family of nations. Since civilization, social advance, industrial progress, national prosperity, have their foundations embedded in natural resources, the future holds promise of a high culture in America. Although the United States con-



tains only about one-twentieth of the world's area and population, it has more than one-eighth of the live stock of the world, grows more than one-fourth the world's supply of grain, two-thirds of the world's supply of cotton, one-tenth of its wool, one-half its annual output of coal, one-half of its lead, zinc and copper, two-thirds of its iron, three-fourths of its oil, and utilizes more than one-third of the water power of the world. Our unmined resources of coal and lignite equal that of the remainder of the world combined.

The American wage earner has more power at his command than any other worker in the world. In terms of man-power he has the equivalent of thirty-six slaves working for him, is three times as effective as the German and twice as effective as the Briton.

America, from its inception, has cared little for tradition, preferring to set its own course, to build its own house, even if crudely, looking always to the future rather than to the past. The individual has been America's special care, and our social and political and religious institutions have been built around him. Individualism has flourished. The United States has outlived most of the European monarchies and is today one of the most vital political institutions in the world.

Beard distinguishes between 'materialistic civilization' and 'spiritual civilization' in this manner: "The term 'materialistic civilization' which has often been applied to stigmatize the modern civilization of the

West seems to me to be a more appropriate word for the characterization of the backward peoples of the East. For to me that civilization is materialistic which is limited by matter and incapable of transcending it; which feels powerless against its material environment and fails to make use of human intelligence for the conquest of nature and for the improvement of the conditions of man. Its sages and its saints may do all they can to glorify contentment and hypnotize the people into a willingness to praise and abide by their fate. But that very self-hypnotizing philosophy is more materialistic than the dirty houses they live in, the scanty food they eat, and the clay and wood with which they make the images of their gods.

"On the other hand, that civilization which makes the fullest possible use of human ingenuity and intelligence in search for truth in order to control nature and transform matter for the service of mankind, to liberate the human spirit from ignorance, superstition, and slavery to the forces of nature, and to reform political and social institutions for the benefit of the greatest number—such a civilization is highly idealistic and spiritual. This civilization will continue to grow and improve itself. But its future growth and improvement will not be brought about by returning to the spiritualistic ideals of the East, but only through conscious and deliberate endeavors in the direction of fully realizing those truly spiritual potentialities which the progress of this civilization has indicated." <sup>28</sup>

It is the individual, then, with his thirst for truth about all things, including himself, which has tempered our politics, religion, and society. The Truth which he seeks to find is his true relationship to all things about him. He would find the true unit of value by which all life is measured; the secret of happiness without divine revelation; the significance of life in terms of spiritual clarity and intellectual integrity; the unity of all progress and the kinship of unity. The individual, having discerned the nature of the truth he seeks, and having determined that other individuals similarly free are searching for the same truth, knows that there are common goals to be sought. He therefore joins in collective movement toward that common goal. It is this collective individualism which the foreign critic—and some native ones as well—cannot understand and he calls it by a name which widely misses the mark. It is this working together in unison of effort and purpose which causes the achievements of the past fifty years to stand out in such brilliant contrast to all past epochs. True, America is not a biological unit, but it is rapidly becoming a cultural and spiritual unit. "It is such a unit which is being created in the United States, and while the task is a difficult one and its completion far off, it is not hopeless. The United States is already a safer and more unified political institution than many countries which have achieved a more cultural unification. It has no Alsace problem, no language conflicts, no political parties as yet divided by religion or race. Socialists and Commu-

nists are not even a respectable, certainly not a respected, third and fourth party. It has no economic problems." <sup>24</sup>

Science is the basis of modern civilization because of its utter impartiality and because of its sense of kinship with a common humanity. It knows no class, caste, or race; is not fed by superstition nor puffed up by idolatry. Side by side with this amazing growth of science,<sup>25</sup> which is also the basis of prosperity and world unification, has come a steady deepening of human sympathy, and the extension of it to all weak and suffering. Human life has been extended by more than a fourth, and one-third of all disease has been lifted from civilized peoples in a half-century. The seventeenth century which saw modern science adolescent, ended judicial torture and religious barbarities for England. The eighteenth, which carried science further, saw France abandon torture, and England and France begin to free their slaves and protect their women and children by law. The nineteenth saw Japan in the Orient, touched by modernism in science, begin to discard the shackles of caste, saw the triumph of science further in the intellectual sphere, and humanized the law and began the systematic raising of the poor, and the systematic national training of the young. Science, founding a firmer basis and stimulating motive for the co-operation of mankind, goes widening down the centuries, and sympathy and pity bind the courses together.<sup>26</sup> This must be set down as a distinct cultural gain for the machine age.

In our age and country man's collective force and knowledge have reached their highest point of development. Man has found more individual freedom in every phase of modern society, and a higher valuation is placed upon humanity for its own sake. Collectively society has established standards of better living, a freer circulation of religious influences, a higher standard of morals and community welfare below which the individual dares not fall. In the interest of making articulate that truth which makes a people free, America has taken the lead in freeing children from the burden of labor and enrolled them in schools, till education has become a passion alike of the adult and the adolescent; millions of workers are enrolled in night schools while laboring by day.

In short, America dares allow the common man to think, and encourages him at it, although realizing the patent fact that when any man thinks he places some portion of the established order in jeopardy. But to place a static order in jeopardy often is a gain rather than a loss. So long as education and the passion for it continues to be widespread, there is little likelihood that life in America will become static or dangerously standardized. Modern civilization, that is, science made manifest, is less standardized than any former civilization, for the machine is the greatest leveler of standards the world has ever witnessed. Man may set up temporary standards to take the place of older ones but it is probable that in setting up new ones he will not make them ugly and inferior. One thing seems certain, that so long as technology

maintains its supremacy change will be constant, civilization will remain free from caste and standards, and culture will have a constantly enriched background on which to reflect an enriched life.



•

PART THREE

RELIGION AND CULTURE

•



*Religion is the vision of something that stands beyond, behind, and within the passing flux of immediate things; something which is real and yet waiting to be realized; something that gives meaning to all that passes and yet eludes apprehension; something whose possession is the final good, and yet is beyond all reach; something which is the ultimate ideal, and hopeless quest. Apart from religion human life is a flash of occasional enjoyments lighting up a mass of pain and misery, a bagatelle of transient experiences. That religion is strong which in its ritual and modes of thought evokes an apprehension of the commanding vision. The worship of God is not a rule of safety—it is an adventure of the spirit, a flight after the unattainable. The death of religion comes with the repression of the hope of adventure.*

*Albert North Whitehead.*

## PART THREE

### RELIGION AND CULTURE

#### I

TO SOME, life is chaos; to others, romance; some there are who see it as high adventure; while to others still, it is sheer tragedy, but for all the several groups the common denominator is religion. The fatal error comes in the adherents of one cult or faith believing that all religion is bound up as a special set of values applicable only to themselves; that all others are without the coveted circle.

This universal tendency toward religion is nowhere more pronounced than in the United States today, but because it does not manifest itself in ancient rites and symbols, the superficial and unthinking proclaim that the whole of America is unspiritual, unintellectual, and unphilosophical. Everywhere men are asking: What of religion under the machine? Is it, too, being transformed in the image of utility and mass production? Isn't the very soul of man being standardized, denaturized, depersonalized? The machine man, Spengler thinks, is being dominated entirely by rationality, the prosaic, the practical, "which conditions his external success in technicalizing, mechaniz-

ing, and standardizing life. But this rationality must not be confused with intellectuality, with spirituality, in the European sense, if by this one understands absorption in the profounder scientific, artistic, and philosophical problems of existence. In this sense the American is unspiritual. . . . Problems do not interest him. Religion is powerful in America only because it has been emptied of its historic content and changed into a religion of optimism."

The plain fact is that some form of deeply embedded religion has always been most prominent in those races, groups, and individuals who have felt least secure in life, least anchored to it, and to whom life has seemed most cruel and unjust. The old ruling castes needed no religion for they were lords of the land. Power was their religion, but they were quick to adopt outwardly and meticulously the prevailing best forms as mighty weapons with which to hold the lowly humbly in line always with the lowly. The powerful received their reward—security, pleasures, riches, the milk and honey of the land—in this life; the peasant, the slave, the serf, the beggar, the homeless, scourged by want, fear, disease, hardships, and with no hope of surcease in the present life, found solace in the thought of peace in a life after death, in that city not made with hands. They humbled themselves gladly in expectation of greater rewards in the next world. They bore hardships without a murmur, and in their exalted moments, studiously fostered for them by the ruling castes, they could

vision with St. John the Divine, that city "of pure gold, like unto clear glass. And the foundations of the walls of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones. The first foundation was jasper; the second sapphire; the third chalcedony; the fourth emerald,"<sup>27</sup> and so on, for there were twelve foundations. And the saved should dwell in this city forever. David of old understood the strength which religion was to the poor, and seeing all the then known world continually ravaged by bands of warriors, said: "The poor committeth himself unto Thee."<sup>28</sup> Many have read their own interpretation into Christ's first statement in his Sermon on the Mount: "Blessed are the poor in spirit for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Christ taught in parables in order that the simple, that is, nearly all the masses, might readily understand his meaning.

Ancient man, awe-struck in the presence of his invisible and mysterious God, and incoherent when he attempted to express himself in worship, built up symbols and rites and rituals; created dogmas and creeds. Leaders grew up and formed themselves into a ruling hierarchy, elaborated these lowly practices, standardized them, and formulated them into a unified pattern of worship, with its ordered procession of masses, fast days, feast days, saints' days, penances, confessions, and dispensations, till the individual was lost sight of. Religion was no longer a personal affair; it became institutionalized. There was an elaborate system of celestial bookkeeping which tabulated every variety of conduct. The whole spiritual

life was finger-printed and 'mugged' and debits and credits were duly balanced. The individual ceased to worship alone; it must be in mass, after a given formula. He was ruled absolutely by the Church which was man's institutionalized symbol of worship. The Church thus became a bulwark of hope, peace, soul-satisfaction; a refuge in days of stress. It demanded that man cease trying to formulate his own ideas of worship, his own attempts at a personal approach to God; all those functions were fulfilled by the Church, which became the greatest instrument of regimentation and standardization of men's minds and spiritual outlook that history records.

Modern man in machine civilization has been drawn into the stream of industrialism, has created a margin of economic safety, and feels less dependence on the comforts of a promised future refuge. He feels a greater security than common man has felt at any time in past history and, therefore, feels less the need of the Church. As mankind rises in the world of material well-being just in that proportion does he descend in his enthusiasm for the Church. Then, with the rapid extension of popular education during the last century he has been touched more profoundly by new ideas than he was in all preceding ages. His horizons have receded, new spiritual values have swept in upon him, new interpretations of the life about him have borne him away from the centuries-old background and anchorage. The old ceremonies and rituals and dogmas have ceased to satisfy the new hunger and he has renounced them.

It is small wonder that church leaders, devoted to the tasks of the established order and too busy to observe new trends, now that new chasms have become too wide to bridge, are bewildered and helpless. Some among them even proclaim the present era as the beginning of the disintegration of civilization itself, while others are seeking to make such adjustments as they may to meet new conditions. What they fail to see is that this disintegration of organized religion as a creedal institution, if in fact there is any disintegration, has been in process of growth for some centuries. "It was remarked in Roman times that the establishment of astronomy by the Greeks had given a sense of order and security to the public mind, and allayed superstitious fears. This process had been going on for ages before the Greeks, above all, in those millenniums of Egyptian and Babylonian history, when the priests began to record with some rough accuracy the regular positions of the brightest of the Heavenly bodies. It was thus that the stars in their course first gave man the idea for seeking other uniformities in the complex and changing tangle of the world below." <sup>29</sup>

But after the decay of early Rome for some ten centuries man was discouraged from trying to adjust his ideas about "the complex and changing tangle of the world." What modern man demands is that his concepts about religion and religious practices square with rationality. His intellectual climate has changed sharply; there are teeth in the gale which he faces. Throwing off the old dogmas which comforted

him for so many centuries and not having found others to take their place he is suffering from temporary exposure. That he is searching desperately for some new certainty, however, is not to be denied, but to say that he is irreligious is to turn the picture upside down. Many who believe in "the old-fashioned orthodoxy" can see nothing but evil in the adoption of a scientific attitude, for science and religion are in hopeless conflict, thereby confessing that God must have "got his wires crossed" when he created laws of science in utter conflict with laws of religion; else there are two conflicting Gods.

It was not coincidence that the twin concepts, popular government and simplicity in religion, matured in the new world together in the same household. The church was the bulwark of social functions in pioneer expansion. Those stern Pilgrims brought with them from the old world a three-point equipment—unyielding hatred for priesthood, a deep distrust of all rulers, and a rigid moral code based on unshakable faith in the righteousness of their cause. In fact, they were so bent on avoiding the miseries and blunders in government which had brought only suffering to them in the home which they had left that they forced every public personage—teacher, preacher, doctor, lawyer, or office holder—into strict conformity with strict observance of one code. Church approval was a certificate of qualification for any office. Churches became rallying points of respectability and decency and order in a rough and turbulent population. Freebooters in public or pri-

vate life had to be forced into respectability or out of the community—in the interest of the public welfare—and the church was the only organized power that could perform that service. Thus early the church became the patron saint of good government and a decent social order. It was always keenly alive to the best interests of the community. It is quite understandable, therefore, that this Puritan anxiety about social welfare and its right to force adherence to a high moral standard, in public and private life, should have become so deeply rooted in every phase of American life. Whole communities became a part of a vast evangelical spirit as if the fate of this vast new world depended—which in large measure it did—upon their watchfulness. The intensity of evangelism toned down with the broadening of interests into other fields, and the asperities of creed and dogma softened, but the idea and concept of the church maintaining its close watch over the social welfare of the community remained. The indirect power of the church<sup>30</sup> over thought and expression increased as the direct power of the church waned. The more people stopped going to church the more necessary it was to maintain the high standards for which the church stood. As the frontier ceased being a menace to orderly life, the standards of the church remained as a limit beyond which it was dangerous and unrespectable to go.

Andre Siegfried writes: "They (the Protestants) contend that if religion does not occupy itself with morals or even politics, it cannot possibly justify it-



self to the conscientious, and surely this is more important than formal belief in hidebound doctrines! Personally I think that it is owing to this penetration of religious thought into everyday life that America feels that she is superior to the Orient." This feeling of individual responsibility for the general welfare has been the chief force sponsoring uplift movements, child labor laws, universal free public education, universal suffrage, prohibition, censorship, and the like. This spirit, which some have called Puritanism, has been most active where abuses to its arbitrary standards have been most pronounced and where the influx of immigrants has been greatest—along the Atlantic seaboard. In its zeal for social betterment it has created many abuses which the critics have been eager to pounce upon. Out of this reaction against the evils of Puritanism has grown up a group of social and literary nihilists who contend that life—government, society, religion—is an individual affair and that it is no business of the church, or Puritanism, to concern itself with the eighteenth amendment, or the ten commandments. Mencken, Nathan, Lewis, and their followers, in their mighty assault on bigotry, boobery, and babbity, which have grown out of a too zealous Puritanism, have created an intolerance worse than that which they denounce. Perhaps, they too, were among the blind men who went to see an elephant, and having caressed the animal's snout proclaimed blandly that the old boy was exactly like a tree. What they fail to understand clearly is that the narrow strip of densely populated country along

the central Atlantic coast does not constitute the whole of America, and the evils which they attack—evils that are genuine—are only the counter-currents and eddies of a larger and deep-moving stream flowing in the opposite direction. Despite isolated manifestations to the contrary there is less of repression, less effort to direct the private life of the individual, more actual liberty granted than at any other time in the history of civilized races. Only a generation ago, to give one example, almost every Protestant in America was barred from card-playing and dancing; now the churches encourage their members in it. Or to go one step further back one finds in 1872 a Methodist school, in the rules of its general government, saying:

“We prohibit play in the strongest terms. . . . The students shall rise at five o’clock summer and winter. Their recreation shall be gardening, walking, riding and bathing without doors, and the carpenter’s, joiner’s, cabinet maker’s or turner’s business within doors. . . . The students shall be indulged with nothing which the world calls play. Let this rule be observed with the strictest necessity; for those who play when they are young will play when they are old.”<sup>31</sup>

Or to go still further back we find an interesting letter which appeared in the Boston Gazette, March 21, 1732, protesting against a proposed Assembly at Peter Pelham’s dancing school.<sup>32</sup> The writer wonders “what could give encouragement to so Licentious and expensive a Diversion in a town famous

for its Decency and Good Order," and proceeds to cite the example of early settlers. "When we look back upon the Transactions of our Forefathers, and read the Wonderful Story of their Godly zeal, their pious Resolution, and their Publick Virtues, how we should blush and lament our present Corruption of Manners and Decay of Religious and Civil Discipline? . . . In vain will our Ministers preach Charity, Moderation, and Humility, to an audience, whose Thoughts are engaged in Scenes of Splendour and Magnificance, and whose Time and Money are consumed in Dress and Dancing."

It seems that the world, rather civilization, has always been tottering perilously on the brink of destruction and decay and that the virtues of our forefathers have always been better back in the good old days than are ours today. And those of tomorrow will be unspeakably bad!

No doubt the strict enforcement of child labor laws, bitterly opposed by manufacturing associations as curtailment of personal liberty and a meddlesome interference in private business, achieves a total good out of all proportion to the harm it does. Freedom for the slaves ruined a whole section of our country economically for two generations, but most people now agree that the ultimate total good is far greater than the evils it created. The eighteenth amendment to the constitution and the accompanying Volstead law, if and when they are enforced, so their proponents claim, will result in a total good that will enormously outweigh the evils resulting from present attempts at enforcement. Sporadic efforts by re-

form groups to suppress what to them seems questionable printed matter—I had almost said literature—strikes me as utterly foolish. To close a Broadway theatre in the name of censorship may be absurd, and most frequently is, but we miss the point of the joke in that proceeding. Censorship, as asinine as it is, is a stroke of profound statesmanship compared with the stupidity of certain playwrights and producers who display vulgar sex dramas of the ultimate in salaciousness in the name of art. If dramatists go to beastiality, cruelty, and vice for their pictures of life, it is not life itself that is wrong, but a total lack of understanding of the meaning of it; they have only entered the basement and mistaken it for the drawing room. But that should not condemn the drawing room. Sex is a real part of life, but it is not the whole of life. In the name of high art these producers might portray an actual birth scene on the stage; that would be realism with emphasis, and a real part of life, but they would neither create art nor depict all of life. They would succeed only in being irreverent and a bit foolish, and entirely lacking in a sense of beauty and vital rhythm. It is all a part of the revolt against convention which is shocking all phases of American life with a quickening current. Such a revolt is not permanent but will end as all social revolts end, in modifying and more clearly outlining the conventions against which the revolt is aimed. Conventions at best are but attempts to determine the main current of the stream and to mark its shoals.

Spengler thinks that in America religion has been

emptied of its historic content and changed into a religion of optimism. He is right only in that it has been emptied of its historic content. While establishing a basis for a newer and more personal religion there is an undeniable loss. In shifting gears to climb a hill or to pull ourselves out of a mudhole we must lose speed temporarily to gain power. Our spiritual life will not be denied, and finding the older modes of expression inadequate, more apt to stifle things spiritual than to liberate, we are intent on fabricating a plan of life scaled more to the modern manner.

The older generations, finding the comforts of the old *mores* gone, are puzzled and bewildered, and when they look at youth they are certain that these fine folks will meet disaster at the first corner. But youth has courage. Nor has it joined any revolt; they have found nothing to revolt against. The sex revolt is not a revolt of youth at all, unless it is a revolt against the dominance of sex in art, literature, and conversation; for normal youth is restrained in the matter of sex. This revolt against sex restraint is led by those who have lost their youth, and being jaded and bored, having measured life by false standards and found it wanting, think they can gain some of the fleeting but real values of life by an abandonment to their passions.<sup>38</sup>

Siegfried sees American Protestantism, as an institution, lax, extraordinarily tolerant and never jealous; but as a moral and missionary force it is the very opposite of French Protestantism in that it is the re-

ligion of the majority, a national religion, and subject accordingly to the classic temptations of all state religions. In order fully to appreciate the influence of Protestantism in this confusion of sects, we must not look at it as a group of organized churches, for its strength lies in the fact that its spirit is national. To make a list of communicants and clergy is useless for many a staunch protestant does not have his name on any church register, while it is safe to say that nearly all persons not actually members of the Catholic or Jewish denominations are protestant in outlook and attitude. American modernism has freed itself to a remarkable degree from dogma, ritual, and the literal interpretation of the scriptures; in fact from all formalities extraneous to purely religious thought. It is no exaggeration to say that all those who come under its influence soon abandon the last shreds of belief in dogma or in direct revelation from God. They feel that it does not weaken their religion in any way to ignore direct revelation as belonging to another age. This phenomenon is all the more surprising to other peoples because so large a part of America's daily life is associated with church influence. Modernism, however, is strictly in line with Puritan traditions, for its chief preoccupation is moral sincerity and social welfare.

It is significant that the church founded the first college in America, and during that period of pioneer expansion the church was the only power sufficiently strong to promote the growth of numerous small colleges which sprang up in the path of the westward

movement. It is only logical that these colleges were pledged to promote such learning as would meet with approval of the somewhat narrow precepts of the church. When later the state took over the function of promoting higher education for the masses there was a wider latitude allowed in the teaching of science, but since the foundations of the state rested on the consent of these same puritan leaders and voters, progress toward academic freedom was slow. But it must be set down as a distinct cultural gain that church and state leaders, touched by the adventurous spirit of science, sloughed off their narrow restrictiveness and gave consent to a policy of almost absolute freedom in the fields of academic and social research. The same persons who set up barriers were the first to destroy them.

## II

In any attempt to assess the present status of culture in the United States one is at once halted for lack of a definition of culture. Was there one culture for Europe and a different one for America; one culture for the seventeenth century and a different one for the twentieth? The answer would seem to be emphatically in the negative. Culture has many of the same ingredients the world over, for all ages, and it springs from a common source—the spiritual side of life. In proportion as the spiritual nature of the individual is developed and enriched in that proportion has he a potential culture. As the civilization

of a given group determines the direction its religion will take, so does religion cast the moulds of its culture.

One may best arrive at a definition or understanding of culture by naming some of its ingredients and manifestations. Religion and culture have many points in common, that is, religion as distinguished on the one hand from theology, and on the other from forms and rituals of worship; that broad humanitarianism of the modern era as manifested in one's approach to God. A cultured man is broadly tolerant and respects those with whom he happens not to see eye to eye. He has a quick responsiveness to beauty; beauty of proportion, line, and form; sensory beauty of a fine painting, a lovely sunset, or a fine symphony; symmetrical beauty as in a magnificent cathedral, a fine skyscraper, or a graceful bridge. Culture makes one courteous and kind, with a deep respect for the rights of others; creates in one a sense of the artistic in workmanship, in chaste speech and habits. Culture plus religion glorifies the commonplace. The cultured person is never guilty of snobbery; has faith and trust in his own ability, tempered by the knowledge of his weakness; and most important of all, he has faith in his fellows. The cultured person does not of necessity imply an educated one, but it does mean a religious one.

Civilization is outward achievement; culture is inner growth. Civilization is a cloak—it may be a cloak of many colors, or perhaps one of dirty drab—capable of being put on without profoundly altering



the nature of the owner, for it concerns itself mainly with material progress, commercial values, social assets. It may, and often does, adorn life without enriching it; may lengthen it without sweetening it. Its illumination, like the sun of a long polar day, lights the way without warming it. A people may develop a high civilization without a correspondingly high culture, or at least much in advance of it. It is ludicrous if not downright pathetic to try to graft an old world culture onto an entirely strange and new civilization under conditions which have moulded our American life-pattern. Many well-meaning individuals have tried that very process, and in their disappointment at the failure have concluded that America not only has no culture but is doomed to a life of mediocrity bereft of beauty and refinement. Since culture is an inner growth it is essentially non-transferable; it is the legitimate child of emotion and reason. The fundamentals of culture, like those of literature, are universal and therefore not dependent on environment or geography though greatly modified by them.

A cultured person feels unembarrassed and at home in any environment or society and he never seeks to embarrass others. He knows only kindness and tolerance, for his life is nourished by truth and beauty. Civilization attempts to give every person a chance to find his own level; culture seeks to raise and spiritualize that level. One of the ingredients of culture is poise. Another is faith; faith in the life one tries to live; faith in the rightness of normal life.

The cultured person never dwells in the gutter to secure his picture of life; he goes to the drawing room and the roof-garden. He lives in two worlds, the physical and the spiritual. The physical world is the one in which he seeks efficiency, dodges automobiles, and becomes a part of the mad scramble of the busy market place for the loaves and fishes of material existence. The spiritual world is one in which he seeks communion with his soul in the enjoyment of beauty; the world of intangible but permanent values.

The newly rich may be, and usually are, highly civilized and adorn their homes with gaudy pictures, inharmonious bric-a-brac and ostentation but they are not necessarily cultured. The smug well-to-do visit the culture centers of the old world and attract attention by their obtrusiveness and blatancy but they are not products of culture and refinement, for "culture suggests depth, intensity, the inward, sometimes the invisible; not speed but sense of direction; not comforts of the body but pleasures of the mind; not soap but purity; not electric light but illumination. It is more lasting than civilization, for it springs not only from the soil of the land, but from the soul of a people." <sup>34</sup>

Although America, in its enthusiasm to tame the wilderness and to lead the way into greater development of the abundant raw materials of a new country, has placed the greater emphasis on the practical side of life, it has not lost sight of the necessity and hunger for inner growth. From the period which

produced a budding literary culture in Irving and Cooper, in Poe and Lowell and Longfellow, in Emerson and Thoreau, we have turned more and more to those influences with which to soften the harshness of the machine and to reduce the strange cacophonies of raucous industrialism to the harmonies of cultural growth. The great upward surge of the masses for more individual comforts and greater physical freedom, has achieved a greater realization in the twentieth century than at any other period in history. So has the struggle for political and religious freedom. But these are only incidents in the slower moving growth toward cultural achievement, and in proportion as the individual has had a greater share in these accretions to his well-being, in that proportion will he become an integral part of a more extensive culture.

In the realm of architecture and sculpture; in the multiplicity of nurseries of the æsthetic enumerated by Michael Pupin; in the field of drama and literature, there is a resurgence of powerful cultural desires and instincts in America which will not be denied. There is every reason to believe that the next few generations will realize the dream of many who want to see in America the center of all those cultural values and agencies on a more widespread and deep-rooted foundation than has been enjoyed by any other people.

The genuine concern of many critics is based on the fear that life under machine domination will atrophy those qualities of refinement already attained and

will destroy that ability of inward contemplation which alone satisfies the soul. They see the harshness of the machine creating a like harshness in the inner nature of the individual. Not at all. The machine has softened the way of material life sufficiently to eliminate many of the cruelties of nature, thus becoming a real instrument of enrichment. Our religion is our spiritual way and law of life, and when religion loses its control over our habits the spiritual side of us suffers, if religion does not become a habit in itself. That depends, of course, upon one's interpretation of what religion is. If it becomes only a bundle of habits in mumbling rituals and exercising certain formalities, it may be counted a good if those habits are forced to give way to a more conscious development of the inner self.

Nearly all older civilizations were based on the irrational, tied down by restrictions of caste and clan rule, immutable outward religious rites, and therefore limited in expansion. In short, they were non-transferable. The newer civilization is based on a more logical religion which emphasizes the individualism of the soul; on a civilization which endeavors to increase the comfort of the outer man while promoting happiness of the inner, all the while trying to extend this good to the greatest number. This civilization is transferable and more capable of expansion. It has been asserted in effect that the humblest European in ages past found a greater contentment in daily life and had a more serene existence than his better paid brother across the Atlantic en-

joys at present; that he was less restless and had learned the secret of sweet contentment. It is quite probable that these European peasants were hypnotized by sage and priest who glorified contentment in humble surroundings and taught them to accept their fate and be sweet about it. Their humility was not a sign of culture; it indicated numb helplessness. The modern worker is more assertive, more liberated, more intent on maintaining his freedom already won, yea, in extending it.

That all his advances are gains, however, cannot be asserted, for many writers see real loss in much that some have counted gain. Charles A. Beard sees a loss in the "thousands who do not rest their jagged nerves in quiet country places, who must spend their waking and sleeping hours amid the dust and stews of the city, and who feel that, with all this rattle and chatter about prosperity, life is lacking in security, in richness, in sweet contentment, and in the joy of inward contemplation. Amid the plethora of goods turned out by the machine, they remain unsatisfied in soul, and encounter no great exaltation of spirit."

Indeed, the fundamental theme in all this industrial era revolves around the question of how the soul of man fares. Many doubt that his happiness has increased at all during this fundamental change in his environment. This question bore sharply in upon me one day when studying the problems inherent in the rapid urbanization of America. What would be the ultimate influence upon our culture? Perhaps a better word would be suburbanization, for in one

generation America has changed from a distinctly rural population to one that is predominantly urban. People have come from the farm and the cross-roads store to larger centers where the lure of the market place is strong. To maintain a semblance of rural freedom coupled with city advantages, those who could afford it have moved away from the heart of the city to the suburb and have become commuters. They spend an hour twice a day on a rumbling train to get to work on time; to get home on time; to continue the process of progress. As I stood on an eminence overlooking a railway station in a suburb of one of America's largest cities and watched this army of commuters swarm from the trains, I tried to reconcile this pull of conflicting forces. The sun had retreated in a cloudless sky leaving its reflection of silver high in the East merging into unpolished bronze of smoke and fog that hung over lake Michigan and Chicago. Many trains thundered past. I watched in fascination those great monsters of steel, juggernauts of speed, come screeching from the city, slow down to a grinding stop, and disgorge their burden of humanity. Bowling electric trains, hissing steam trains, following one another in monotonous succession, discharged other hundreds of commuters, and rushed forward to other stations still farther on—all loaded with daily habits of the busy market place.

From trains to waiting cabs they rushed—these scramblers after the loaves and fishes of materialistic needs and luxuries. Some walked in tense groups,

preoccupied with the hectic vagaries of the day's business, not cognizant of being a part of a group. Others hurried forward singly, or by twos and threes, jostled together, separated, pressed on silently, nervously. Only a few were light-hearted. Happiness seemed afar off in some other world. Perhaps they would catch a glimpse of that world tomorrow—or next week, but now they must hurry and be off, like “some unhappy Master whom unmerciful disaster follows fast and follows faster till their songs one burden bore”—home and food and rest. Rest? Rest without relaxation!

The affairs of the village must be attended to! Politics, steering committees, Boards—Boards of every conceivable sort and function. Schools, fraternal orders, twelve organized churches, Rotary clubs, Commercial clubs, Lions clubs, Kiwanis clubs, garden clubs, literary clubs, parks, patriotic organizations, library and musical clubs—all with their mechanisms to be looked after. By actual count there were seventy-three distinct and well-organized clubs, or groups, in a city of fewer than ten thousand population, each being served by a Board and committees, and each motivated by high and solemn purposes of uplift.

What was it all about—this mad rush of doing, merely doing? Was it quite sane?—this running hither and yon at reckless speed? Was it of necessity growing pains of the American soul? Or was it a symptom of decay? The speed of the race is increasing. Occasionally a runner tires of the killing

pace, cries out against it, but not being heard continues to run in order to hold his place. Others, weary, step out for a season to rest, thereby losing their chances altogether. There are others yet who, being deficient and seeing a brother runner gaining in the race, trip him so that falling he is trampled under foot, for no one has time to lift up a fallen brother!

The scene depressed me, I confess, and raised unanswered questions about the ultimate result; that tremendous energy being expended so wantonly, and to what purpose? Then I thought of a quiet eighteenth century evening when a million peasants bowed over their hoes and plows at precisely the same moment to perform a uniform rite of devotion in humility to their God—then trudge silently home. A glance into a typical peasant home of that period reveals only articles of utility—articles of the crudest sort—or symbols to suggest the virtue of poverty and humility. Nothing of sweetness and joy and light abounded! No culture there! Just beneath that calm expression of contentment might be seen on closer examination, only numb despair. The picture of Edwin Markham's "The Man With a Hoe," brought a suggestion of the undeniable superiority of conditions as regards health, sanitation, good food, better clothes, better living conditions in every phase of the modern worker's life. Then energy was suppressed; now it is expressed, disciplined energy, in manning the machinery of social control. The exercise of this energy is rapidly creating what might be



considered at once the results and instruments of culture.

Michael Pupin has this to say: "Consider now the vast number of museums, picture-galleries, conservatories of music, philanthropic societies, institutions of higher learning, cathedrals, which, following in the path of advancing science, have come into existence during my American experience of fifty-four years. Consider, also, that all these nurseries of the æsthetic and spiritual activities of the American soul were made possible by individual donations of private citizens, leaders of our American industrialism, and it will be obvious that the only materialism in this industrialism will be found in the material wealth which makes these nurseries of the idealism of the American life possible. I cannot help seeing behind the American machines and American industrialism a spirit of that rare idealism which guided Washington, Lincoln, and other American leaders of men."

It is noteworthy that America, so recently having conquered the last physical frontier, is not willing to curb the spirit of adventure, but is actively promoting adventurous scientific endeavor in every phase and avenue of human welfare. It is not only conquering new frontiers but is re-arranging old alignments. All older cultures were based on an alliance between political and religious power, an equilibrium between the governing and leisure classes. Those distinctions and alignments no longer exist. In their place there is a new union of complementary forces, spiritual and cultural, and science has performed the marriage cere-

mony. Science furnishes the only basis on which a democracy can function because it brings relief from a slavish dependence on massed human labor. It has freed the individual and it is the first time in the history of any society that cultural forces and achievements have become the possessions of the individual and not an exclusive class possession.

Those who bemoan our lack of culture and who deplore the crudities and superficialities of thought and action and sensation in our day are rarely inhuman enough to wish the old regime back.<sup>35</sup> They are merely lacking in intelligence when they crave a result without the conditions which produced the result. They certainly would not wish to return to the sad conditions of the Middle Ages, "when the only engines were perpetual motion toys that wouldn't work; when monks and nuns, cut off from the most normal of human relations, filled their own cloisters and overflowed upon the countryside; when the holy office was frightening the world out of its wits, and saints, devils, witches and magicians were as popular as the movies; when all forms of lunacy thrived, even producing types similar to itself, such as lycanthropy, in which men transformed themselves into were-wolves. Every culture has its devastating psychological effect, and it is yet to be proved that machines are worse than black magic, or chattel slavery, or the blood sacrifice."

If one is disturbed by the picture of seventy-three distinct organizations, each with its own governing Board and committees, in a city of less than ten thou-

sand population, with similar conditions existing in more or less degree in every city in America, one must remember that it is democracy at work; that social forces have become possessions of the masses. The average citizen is training himself in details of community government, individual responsibility, social welfare awareness, which was once performed, when performed at all, by the hereditary ruling and leisure classes. If our individual collectivism does things crudely and seems at times a bit foolish, one has only to glance at the record of any past civilization to see how much more foolishly and tyrannically the ruling hierarchy did them then. This individuality is another distinct gain for our technological culture.

### III <sup>86</sup>

In the welter of comment on American social conditions and some of our more pressing social problems a few facts stand out clearly and should be reiterated till their full import is acknowledged.

In spite of all we hear about bachelor maids, the high cost of supporting a wife, and the tendency to postpone marriage, young people are marrying earlier than they did a generation ago. From 1910 to 1920 the percentage of girls who became wives before reaching the age of twenty, rose from 25.7 per cent to 28.6 per cent. For each year from 15 to 34 the percentage of either sex married was greater in 1920 than it was in 1910. And the fondness of Americans for wedlock is growing; they are one of the most married

peoples on earth. In all Europe only the Slavs and Magyars surpass them. Their high marriedness reflects a prosperous rural life, ease of making a living, smallness of a servant class, and a social position of women which prompts them to scorn irregular sex relations. From 1890 to 1920 the percentage of males over 15 years of age married (this does not include those married a second time) rose from 53.9 to 59.2—a tenth. The percentage of females over 15 years of age married rose from 56.8 to 60.6—a fifteenth.

There are some who see in our declining birth-rate an indication of decadence; others just the reverse. In 1900 in American cities a thousand foreign-born women could show 612 children under five years of age while a thousand native American women could show but 392 children. Our higher standard of living accounts in part for this difference, for we have adjusted our birth-rate to economic conditions. While our birth-rate has decreased modern science has taught us to reduce our death-rate almost by half. If our birth-rate had remained at its 1800 level while our death-rate was being reduced to its present level, we should, in a brief time, be approaching a population pressure comparable to some of the old world civilizations. Malthus, an eighteenth century English clergyman, produced a doctrine which indirectly approved war, famine, and disease as a means of reducing population pressure. He believed that population constantly tended to outrun the food supply. Birth control had not yet been invented, so there was no hope to be had other than by allowing "nature"

to take its course and kill off the surplus by occasional wars, famines, disease, and the like. While disease was giving way at the approach of science, famine was being banished from modern nations by improved transportation, perfecting the art of food preservation, the greater stabilization of agriculture by water control, and better marketing conditions, and a higher standard of living.

What science has done in the conservation of human life may be stated succinctly. The average length of life of the backward people of India, China, rural Russia, and some other Asiatic countries, is about 26 years; in America it is nearly 65 years. Our grandparents lost one child out of every four born, before the end of the first year. Eastern Europe still does. The Orient loses one out of every two, while America now loses only one out of every eleven "In all its past," says Ross, "reckoned by the prehistoric archaeologists at more than a million years, humanity never had such a marvelous streak of luck as it has had in the last half century. It has been shown how to cut its mortality in two. Hence much of the doctrinal hard tack cherished by our ancestors wandering in the stony wilderness may be thrown away now that the vine and the fig tree are in full view. Their orthodox views then held that life is short and uncertain; that sickness is 'sent'; that an epidemic is God's chastisement; that the earth is still in need of replenishing as it was right after the Deluge; that the dull begetter of sixteen morons has earned his country's gratitude; that 'God sends babies

and He will take care of them'; that 'when God sends mouths He sends meat'; that women are here for maternity and little else; that her foreordained lot is to bear a dozen children, half of whom will die in the cradle; that for her to crave any other lot is impious and unwomanly; that mental defectives have a 'natural right' to breed their kind; that man has a 'natural right' to migrate; that for this reason every people is under sacred obligation to admit such population surplus as may develop anywhere on the globe."

It is a gain if a young married couple, let us say of the middle class type and of moderate means, brings into the world three children, rears them to maturity amid cheerful surroundings and home life, with plenty of wholesome food and sufficient clothing for all occasions, builds in them a sound body, educates them and gives them a background of good citizenship, and instills in them a commendable degree of culture. Ordinary conditions will give them a reasonable assurance of living to the age of sixty-five years. All three will graduate from high school and possibly two will finish college. By the age of twenty they will have acquired a Ford and learned its secrets; will have formed many contacts beyond the immediate neighborhood, some knowledge of the world in general, will have gained a working knowledge of the community make-up, and some idea of business; they will know how to maintain good health and how to live without being boorish. Their imaginations will have been quickened; life will be high adventure, and they will have a 'forward' vision.

The same couple, living in one of the older civilizations, would bring into the world from ten to sixteen children, bury at least a third of them before they were old enough to leave the cradle, "raise" the others in ignorance, poverty, and superstition, fed from the cradle up on old-fashioned "Hell-fire and Brimstone." They would grow up in a crowded hovel, with little of sanitation and a few of the necessary comforts of life; undernourished and docile, or unpolished brutes. They would go into mature life poorly equipped to wrest even the meagerest personal joys out of existence, and would have excellent prospects—at least half of them would—of succumbing before the age of forty. Their imaginations would never be kindled by the reading of a single page, for learning was a possession principally of the privileged classes. Life would be mainly dumb wonder, or hopeless confusion and meaningless—only a short, shadowy journey in this vale of tears.

Few persons would deliberately choose the latter picture, yet that is exactly what they, who advocate back from the technical, stand to get.

One of the real dangers which threatens to warp this budding culture in the United States into a repulsive dwarf might be labeled, for lack of a more expressive appellation, Philistinism. A philistine is a vulgar person who is deficient in liberal culture and refinement; whose scope is limited to selfish and material interests, and who scorns one who tries to occupy a better station and attitude. We have extended the material comforts of life to the masses in

greater degree than has ever been attempted by any former civilization. Many of the recipients of this broad-scale prosperity have affected a surprising smugness, contentment, and self-satisfaction closely approaching selfishness. That they have substituted one bigotry for another is clearly indicated by the emphasis which they place on the practical possessions. James Truslow Adams says that the average man on the street today is as much a bigot about "Science" as the average man in Europe a thousand years ago was about the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church, and for the same reason—he is breathing the intellectual climate of his day.<sup>37</sup> In the tenth century Catholicism was the accepted mode of thought and no sensible person questioned it.

There is this saving element in the situation, however, which cannot be overlooked. In the age to which Adams refers, and for centuries following it, the bedrock of Catholicism was dogma and the hierarchy's ability to enforce it; the bedrock of science is skepticism. Skepticism is merely an individual exercising his right to think for himself. Then, skepticism was punishable with death; today it is counted a virtue—if one doesn't stop at being a skeptic. It is precisely this point which contains the germ of hope; the mass has given up its former certainty but it will not be denied another. They are not stopping at being doubters; they are waking to the fact that a vast world of thought and emotion exists; that behind the curtain which once shut off their drab world, beyond the world of utility and the practical, there is



a world of adventure, romance, orderliness, and emotional significance.

The culture of other ages was confined to a surprisingly small number; the man in the mass didn't count. Today he is coming out of the mass to assert his identity, and though his mental gyrations may be crude and halting, his progress upward may be unaccountably slow in bringing him to the next level above, the fact that he is stirred must be counted a tremendous gain. The upper strata who have, in every society, been the moulders of culture, are as active as ever, but the spotlight has been focused on the man lower down merely because people are interested in knowing how this sudden freedom and activity will affect him. This vague restlessness and stirring of the mass inevitably results in a modification of the old order. If, in America, we see the organized symbols of religion sinking into desuetude, its various units being kept alive temporarily by artificial respiration, it doesn't mean that religion itself is being abandoned. The prevailing skepticism, born of new material comforts and a shifting of values to the individual, has not destroyed his deep-lying fundamental instincts; it merely reveals them in stronger light. The dramas and tragedies of his own life—births, joys, failures, deaths, happiness—have raised many questions for the lowly individual and a few days feasting will neither blot them out nor answer them for him. He is returning to them today with renewed insistence, but organized religions have no answer for him. If he is turning aside from the

churches it is because they have failed to gauge the significance of his problems.

But he will build, is building today, for his spiritual life a temple of greater beauty. "I do not believe that a few generations of scientific teaching have permanently altered man's nature. I believe that before long he will insist, simply because he cannot help himself, on some restoration of spiritual and moral explanations and values in his world. . . . Civilizations may rise and fall, but man will still insist in the face of every shred of contrary evidence, that he is a personality, that there is a scale of values which transcends the useful, that there is more in love and beauty than a complex of instincts, that there is a mystery and a meaning hidden in the universe, and he will still frame answers to his eternal why? If science cannot lead into some new world of interpretation, it will be thrust aside, except as a tool, and man will turn to some new philosophy of life." <sup>88</sup>

The philistines are having their sideshows as they've always done but the attention which they are attracting is because of their blatancy; not because of numbers or importance.



•

**PART FOUR**

**POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT**

•

*I am one of those who think that the only test and justification of any form of political and economic society is its contribution to arts and science—to what may be roundly called culture.*

*John Dewey.*

## PART FOUR

### POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT

#### I

A EUROPEAN in America is rather puzzled when he comes to look for the state, thinks Andre Siegfried.<sup>89</sup> for the Federal government represents only certain strictly limited aspects of sovereignty. Civil legislation is almost entirely vested in state legislatures which make the laws governing the daily lives of the people. "To the Protestant American, the state is less a self-contained organism than a simple method of expressing the will of the people. We might even go so far as to say that in the eyes of the conscientious Protestant it is merely the guardian of the morals of the community, for he would never dream of considering it superior to the body of citizens taken as a whole. In this respect the American conception of the state is the antithesis of the German. The American is so distinctly national that its opponents are usually foreigners, like the Lutherans, who are accustomed to seeing the government subordinate to religion, or to the Catholics, who claim for the family—in reality for the church—an independence which the civil community is always trying

to usurp. Out of this arises two schools of thought: the American or Puritan, in which the individual is subordinate to the group, and secondly the foreign, in which the excessive ambitions of the community are resisted."

It is not the purpose here to go into detail of governmental organization and function, but first to trace those factors and influences which have shaped our concept of the state; second, to present the status and trend in American government; and third, to predict the probable course of the future, with particular regard for the effect on individual and collective culture-patterns of this democracy.

Broadly speaking there have been three distinct phases in the development of our political democracy. Although we have never had a privileged ruling class, we have experienced two approaches to one. The first approach was in reality an actual experience with a privileged ruling class inherited from old world traditions. It did not last long, soon giving way to a rule of the masses, which constitutes the second phase of our experiment. The third phase is ostensibly an extension of the second but the actual situation reveals a small class exercising most of the power, political and economic, and approaching a situation similar, according to the fears of many, to that experienced by ancient Rome. Let us examine a little more closely into these three phases.

During the period of Federalist power the prevailing sentiment was aristocratic. Federalism was essentially a movement for the restoration of the older

order of things. That is, it believed in a ruling class. The War of the Revolution separated the colonies from the mother country but there was little or no change in the social make-up of the states. The colonies had been ruled by those of gentle breeding, those whose possessions in land were considerable, the gentry. The whole leadership of the colonies in pre-Revolutionary times, political, spiritual, economic, and educational, had reposed in the hands of a comparatively small class of high social standing, well educated and rich, or well-to-do. Not only were the highest offices filled from this class but the subordinates in office were of much the same caliber. They believed an apprenticeship should be served by long contact with statesmen and the machinery of government before one should be intrusted with public service. It was an accepted policy. This type of statesman had been at the helm during those dark days of colonial troubles, and later during the Revolution, and when the hardships and sufferings under the Articles of Confederation and the conflicts of interest among the independent states increased, the views of the conservatives again prevailed. To be sure the gentry were high-minded gentlemen and were working earnestly to insure the rights of the individual, but the only viewpoint they could possibly entertain was that those rights could best be safeguarded by the aristocratic few. To them the assertions of equality in the Declaration of Independence were only convenient phrases and idealistic platitudes, in the same category with many well-meaning



planks in our modern party platforms. But to the struggling patriots of those days, who had nothing but a hope for better things in the future to live for, those promises were gleams from a friendly lighthouse in an angry sea. The rising generation had begun to think in terms of that liberty and equality, whereas the ruling classes had passed them by as meaningless phrases of good intentions from an impractical dreamer. They were never meant to be taken seriously. "Most of this class," says Hadley, "would have been horror-stricken at the thought of universal suffrage. The thought of slavery did not bother them." They were bent on strengthening the military arm of the government; on making the central government the controlling force of the nation. They had no thought of popular government.

The election of Jefferson marked the end of the first attempt in the new government to establish a ruling class. John Dewey says that "it is not without significance that Andrew Jackson, the first church-going President, was also the first political representative of the democratic frontier, the man who marks the change of the earlier aristocratic government into a democratic republic."<sup>40</sup> One must take issue with Dewey's statement that Jackson marked the change from the earlier aristocratic government to a democratic republic. Jefferson very clearly marks that change. The broad sympathies of Jefferson for the democratic impulses of the ordinary individual made him the logical and inevitable leader of all those discontented groups that crystallized un-

der the Federalists. The framers of the Declaration of Independence, that is, those who were less far-visioned than Jefferson, looked upon some of its bold professions of liberty and equality as visionary and not to be taken too seriously. But twenty-five years had brought about tremendous changes in the outlook of the younger generation of voters. To the youths of Seventy-six the doctrines of that document were very real, and on their plastic minds pulsating impressions were made. It is not strange, therefore, that when those same youths were voting and establishing their power that they should vote to defeat the ruling caste which bore such resemblance in habits to those defeated on the field of battle two decades earlier. There was a growing conviction that the perquisites of office should be open to all on equal footing.

It is noteworthy, too, that the first secessionist movement occurred in Jefferson's first administration. A group of aristocratic leaders from New York and the New England states were so disgruntled at being swept from power and so distrustful of the rising power of the "rabble" that they were convinced sound government was doomed. Accordingly they planned to establish a conservative government of the older colonies and leave the uncouth West to work out its own salvation. Upon hearing of the election of Jefferson the brother of the President of Yale college said: "America now has a government ruled by knaves and blockheads."

Jefferson mistrusted manufacturing groups and all

attempts at concentration of wealth. He wanted America to remain agricultural and to let all factories remain in Europe. He saw, in the first decade of the nineteenth century, the "privileged" ruling class swept from power; saw the same class become the prime movers in the great manufacturing enterprises in the New England states; saw the beginning of the concentration of commercial and credit agencies in the East. The last decade of the century saw that class no longer endeavoring to secure political office but actually supporting the commoner in office; not only supporting him but controlling the machinery which elected him and for the most part the policies which emanated from his activities.

If we may represent the external machinery of government—parties and administrations—graphically, we will draw a horizontal line to represent each major party movement, or the sentiment back of the party. The line at the top must represent the Federalists, or conservatives—the small-group party; the line at the bottom, the broadest possible popular group. In between are parallel lines representing various shades of popular or semi-popular sentiment. Vertical lines will represent four-year periods. The graph line will start with the first President and continue with the top line till Jefferson's election is reached. There is a sharp break and the line dips. It begins its downward trend, and with the exception of a slight upturn under John Quincy Adams, there is an uninterrupted descent till it touches bottom in the administrations of Jackson. It has hovered near

the bottom of the graph through all succeeding administrations.

The reasons for this constant descent are not hard to find. After the War of 1812, a high protective tariff, mostly for the benefit of the manufacturing East, was passed. The commercial interests of the East, the stronghold of the Federalists, controlled credit. At the same time a steady stream of population poured over the Alleghanies into the great fertile fields of the Middle West. An agrarian population, free from traditions of creed and caste, was developing. There was plenty of room to expand and little need for competition. Every man was independent to go his own way with little regard for convention. But their eagerness and anxiety for "building up" the country resulted in the inflation of commercial values and partook of the nature of a "boom period." There was little or no capital for such rapid growth, however, and the distrusted aristocratic East had to be called upon to furnish the financial aid. The boom period, as is the nature of such boom periods, was followed by rapid deflation, resulting in intense suffering among the hardy pioneers. The bubble had burst. The years of 1819 and 1820 were years of bankruptcy, leaving the individual farmer staggering under a heavy mortgage. Local banks became disorganized and suspended business. There was no medium of exchange except worthless paper money. Produce found no market. Everywhere there was bitter distress and suffering. The United States Bank had nothing but frozen assets. The West blamed the money power of the East and especially

the iniquitous banking system introduced by the Federalists. Because of the stagnant conditions of the agricultural West the manufacturing East suffered. Everywhere there was unrest. The West and the South united upon certain general remedies and measures of relief while the East was uncertain what course to follow. The former, having made up their minds as to the reasons for the distress, very quickly fastened upon a remedy. The sullen discontent solidified itself, and in the election of 1828 a leader came forward who embodied the true spirit of the West—the spirit of a crusader, uncouth, fiery, and dauntless, possessing none of the arts of the demagogue, nor the polish of the statesman—Andrew Jackson. He was sincere but uneducated. He was the leader of the greatest political revolt in the history of America.

The last vestige of that doctrine of the more conservative that an apprenticeship should be served by long contact with statesmen and the machinery of government before one had intrusted to him the duties of public service, had vanished. Now, anybody who could vote or attract votes could render “public service.” The frontiersman had come into his own.

Jackson was a common man of the soil. The politician deftly exploited every prejudice and social cleavage and presented Jackson to the voters as a sort of divine leader and miracle-man come to lead them into the promised land. The teaching took root in the minds of vast numbers and increased the

fervor and enthusiasm at election time. Webster wrote: "Persons have come five hundred miles (with no railways) to see Jackson, and they really seem to think that the country has been rescued from some dreadful danger." Inauguration was a day of deliverance.

"The vast popular army," says Ostrogorski, "which marched triumphantly through the streets of Washington dispersed to their homes, but one of its divisions remained, the corps of marauders which followed it. This was composed of the politicians. They wanted their spoils. By way of remuneration for their services they demanded places in the Administration. They filled the air of Washington like locusts; they swarmed in the halls and lobbies of the public buildings, in the adjoining streets; they besieged the residence of Jackson and his ministers. Jackson hastened to admit the justice of their claims. His official newspaper had announced before hand that he would 'reward his friends and punish his enemies.' The punishment began at once. Many government servants were dismissed without a hearing and without a word of explanation, for the sole reason that they were, or were suspected of having been hostile to Jackson and that their places were wanted. Every official henceforth was at the mercy of informers. A reign of terror set in in public departments. During the first year of his Presidency Jackson got rid of more than two thousand persons, whereas all his predecessors together had dismissed, from the founding of the Republic, only seventy-four

public servants, most of them for cause. The new men who were put in the place of the old ones were often quite incompetent; their sole merit was that they had helped Jackson."

Jackson boldly championed the doctrine that the lucrative offices, being public and not private property, should be passed around. His rotation in office was applied with fervent zeal from the lowest to the highest on the list. Two developments in constitutional growth have aided the Jackson policies—the introduction of universal manhood suffrage and the enlarged application of the elective principle to office. As suffrage became open to all on equal terms it lost much of its attraction for large numbers of the enlightened, the former ruling class; it had become cheapened in their estimation. Just in proportion as that class withdrew from active participation in the management of policies novices with personal motives filled the gap and assumed control. The toga of public service, whose brilliant hues once attracted intellectual giants and stalwarts among public-spirited men, had now fallen from its high estate to a mere symbol of usurped authority held by the man or the organization that controlled the richest spoils. It degraded public service by destroying its stability. It promoted intrigue and factional strife by substituting personal favor for genuine merit. It placed a premium on stupidity and trickery.

The privileged had been ruled off the board and "privileges" scattered to the commoners—in the name of democracy. Thus the second phase of our

political democracy had been entered. This "dislike of privilege" says Dewey, "extended itself to fear of the expert and the highly educated. The tradition of higher education for the clergy was surrendered in the popular denominations. Religion was popularized, and thought, especially free-thought which impinged adversely upon popular conceptions, became unpopular, too unpopular to consist with political success. It was almost an accident that Lincoln could be elected President. Nominal tribute, at least, had to be paid to the beliefs of the masses." <sup>41</sup>

## II

Triumphant democracy of the Jacksonian brand so thoroughly permeated American thought and became so much a part of public life that there was no considerable opposition till the birth of the Republican party came on the scene at the time the democratic party of pre-Civil War days began to disintegrate. Before the close of Jackson's first term of office it was apparent that some step was necessary to hold together threatening factions within the ranks of the President's adherents and to perpetuate the system of spoils. A number of crack wire-pulling politicians, swept together in the campaign days, now basking in the sunshine of presidential patronage, and headed by the master politician of them all, Martin Van Buren, formed what is known in our political history as "The Kitchen Cabinet." With the help of lieutenants in the states the Kitchen Cabinet succeeded



in creating a strong sentiment all over the country in favor of a national convention. The convention thus held shortly afterward displayed considerable enthusiasm which had the appearance of being genuine, but it was only the result of a skillfully propagandized "demand." The delegates for the most part were office-holders or office-seekers and the results were just as the wire-pulling Kitchen Cabinet had fore-ordained. Political methods became firmly entrenched. Van Buren, though quite unpopular throughout the country, was, at the behest of Jackson, nominated for Vice-President. Jackson's hold over the common people was so strong that he and his henchmen were able to foist on the country Van Buren as his successor.

The convention system thus established in 1831 found a ready acceptance by the embryo politicians everywhere and became within a short time the central controlling power-plant of political parties. The politician with the convention machinery at hand fattened on the ever-increasing number of offices to be filled. To simplify matters these crafty spoils-men managed to have elections for all offices—city, county, state, national—on the same day, and the names of all candidates on the same ballot. The longer the ballot the more bewildered became the voter and the more jubilant became the politician. The ballots have increased in length till in a recent election in Cook county, Illinois, to give but a single example, the voter was confronted with a ballot containing a list of 380 names. Many voters need "ad-

visers" to vote "intelligently" on the issues and personalities involved and the politicians obligingly supplied the service.

If we look upon Federalism, which in its essence was rule by a small group of leaders and statesmen, as the first distinct phase of our political democracy, and upon Jacksonism, which was rule by the uncouth masses, as the second phase, we are now ready to trace the third phase. This was an outgrowth of the second and also became rule by a small group, but this time the small group, instead of being aristocrats and diplomats, was at the other end of the list—rule by a few politicians dominated by the bosses. We grew tired of the dignified, statesmanlike procedure under the guidance of trained diplomats and demanded that all qualifications and prerequisites to an official career be cancelled and insisted that the emoluments of office be "passed around."

It is not a matter of great surprise therefore that the better class of professional men withdrew from politics. The commercial classes did likewise, became absorbed in making a living and withdrew from active participation in the growing business of politics. The business of government soon became the business solely of a class of politicians. The entire nation gradually became divided into distinct groups, blocs, factions, and geographical sections which have remained distinct in rather unpleasing fashion to this day. On the one hand the large majority of citizens, following their individual pursuits, absorbed in professional lines, commercial struggles, and a vast army

of wage earners; on the other hand a small compact minority which concentrated on politics and monopolized that business. Being a monopoly in control of our enormous national treasures, corruption appeared on an unexpectedly large scale. Taxes increased inordinately. The public treasury was systematically plundered, and abuses of public office went on apace. Those who reaped the reward of this newly systematized graft were seldom in any sense of the term representative of the people; only delegates—too often self-appointed—of a small and compact minority.

The Democratic party had largely destroyed itself by the middle of the century. It had been the champion of agricultural classes, the plantation, the trader, states rights, and grew into the rôle of champion of minorities and unorganized groups everywhere. The Republican party was to be the tool and champion of the industrialists. From its inception, particularly in its period of consolidation after the Civil War, the Republican party advocated a partnership between governmental agencies and private enterprise. One early instance of this, among others, is found in the manner in which the Credit Mobilier, chartered in 1867 as a Pennsylvania fiscal organization, became a combination of governmental forces and private business. The Credit Mobilier had for its immediate object the construction of the Union Pacific Railway. This object was of course legitimate but it opened the public treasury for self-seeking politicians to loot in the name of public necessity and improvement.

The Mobilier stock was almost worthless at first—till the greater part of it had become absorbed by a handful of office-holders and politicians; then suddenly it began to pay enormous dividends. Suspicions were aroused; and in the investigations which followed many of the political managers and members of Congress were found to be in possession of much of the stock, supposedly given to them, or “sold to them far below par” with the evident intention of favorably affecting their votes. In the presidential election of 1872 intense bitterness was aroused and the Mobilier organization was accused of flagrant dishonesty and fraud. In the governmental investigation which followed, many prominent Republicans, including the Vice-President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, senators, and representatives, and many lesser political lights were indicted for having accepted bribes in return for their influence in favor of the Union Pacific Railway. It resulted in one of the greatest Congressional scandals in American history. The work of the Union Pacific, financed through the Pennsylvania credit organization, was paid for largely in stocks and bonds of the railway so that the two organizations came to be identical. It is significant, therefore, and important to keep in mind as bearing on subsequent events, that the leaders of the whole movement, from its advocacy in state and national conventions, in Congress, in the intricate network of propaganda creating favorable sentiment throughout the country, and the actual execution of the work, were men most active as offi-

cially connected with government. They were the individuals who also received the largest number of shares of stock.

The example, in lesser degree, might be repeated many times but the story is essentially the same. The men who have been most active in forming corporation monopolies have been most active in organizing and promoting local, state, and national political influence. This has meant, of course, through the Republican party; for the Democratic party has been without influential leadership while the Republican party made good on its promises of high protection for industries. Statesmanship, as a career or a means to an end, was "too expensive" for the meager returns evidenced. Gradually power, political and otherwise, was exercised by those who manipulated industries and corporation machinery to freeze out the small stock-holders from any voice in actual management of the business affairs. Management was concentrated in the hands of a handful of major stockholders who further focused control in the hands of one man who directed for this handful of men the entire corporation. He was the boss. The small stockholder found it impossible to get the ear of the boss. Likewise political machinery formed a closed corporation with the rank and file of the party, the average voter, being thus shut out from control.

Although the Republican party is the party of wealth, the champion of prosperity, the strong and the smug, it has not forgotten how to appeal to the small-town ego, and to rural simplicity whence com-

eth all abiding virtues. It has stolen most of the Democratic thunder. Wasn't Lincoln, the typical American, also a product of Western frontier conditions? The Republican party is very sound when it repudiates cosmopolitanism and even relegates to second rank the glories of a triumphant industrialism.<sup>42</sup> Although it has been the patron saint of financial success "its moral center of gravity is located in the small towns where the Protestant traditions are still alive and memories of the past are a household word. The legend of Lincoln, that ideal type of American, brought up on the Bible and the British classics in his vigorous pioneer childhood, is as fresh as ever. Al Smith always conjures up East Side New York, that unbelievable Babel of races; but when Republican propaganda pictures Colonel Coolidge, the President's late father, they show him singing Psalms on Sunday in the humble Congregational Church in Vermont, and their sentimental picture seems more in keeping with the Lincoln tradition and penetrates much more deeply into the hearts of the old timers. We must not let the triumphs of city life blind us to the fact that it is in the tranquil backwaters of the old American towns that the men of sterling influence are created. They may be neither the richest nor the most brilliant, but they inspire confidence."

The Democratic party is essentially a party of protest; a champion of various downtrodden groups—those oppressed by one evil or a dozen. It has so many diverse elements in it and is so lacking in unity

that one wonders how, as a national party, it holds together at all. Along the Eastern strip of country where the immigrants are most numerous, the Democratic party is strong; it offers him a welcome and a protection. In urban centers where there is a strong Catholic population, there the Democratic party is strong, for the Catholics are a minority element and feel themselves more in harmony with democratic ideals. It has always been the champion of the State against the encroachment of the Federal government; the poor South against the rich North, and so on down the list. Very many of the "reforms" in governmental functions have been brought about under Democratic Administrations. The Republicans have prospered during material success and prosperity; the Democrats in "hard times."

The concept of popular sovereignty has enjoyed a prestige in America rarely experienced in any country. If the demagogue has found rich pastures it may also be counted a gain, for in a democracy the demagogue at his worst is a vaccine against revolution. In a rich and undeveloped country, with the dangers of an autocratic or oligarchic tyranny pushed aside, the great body of citizens were content to let their interest in politics drop to second or third place while they went about the business of production and the creation of a comfortable community life. The real creative efforts and achievements of the American people are most apparent in the communities. To make more effective the will of the community there has grown up group initiative which crystallizes

in clubs, committees, and associations. "Nowhere else in the world," says a noted foreigner, "are associations so powerful as in the United States, and especially if they have some religious or social propaganda in view. The goodwill, the funds, and the devotion at their command are enormous. With their excellent equipment and ceaseless and varied activity, they are the real expression of the community, and they enable it to carry out definite programs of reform." <sup>43</sup>

While it is probably true that the ruling motive of many of these community organizations is selfishness, nevertheless they exert a powerful influence toward distinctive community life and in disciplining otherwise random energy, and they hold in reserve possibilities of influencing national policies by their ability to mobilize public opinion. The very fact of this power, however, creates the danger that it may be used in wrong channels; it may be used to mislead public opinion or to stifle it altogether. Walter Lippman holds that many of our national evils and scandals are due to quiescent public opinion, or opinion consciously directed to the end that selfishness be served. These "special interests"—big business, a corporate press, bossism, crooked politics, tax iniquities—grew up within our country, "were promoted by American citizens, admired by millions of them, and acquiesced in by almost all of them. Whoever thinks that business corruption is the work of a few inhumanly cunning individuals with monstrous morals is self-righteous without excuse. Capitalists did not violate the public conscience of America; they



expressed it." We are being pinched by the very acts our own public opinion nurtured.

Prohibition furnishes an excellent example of the manner in which we have revealed ourselves to ourselves. We don't like the picture which has resulted from our posing and indignantly denounce it; but the picture is true to life. There are always enough evils inherent in any attempt at social reform to satisfy the most fastidious revolter against convention without attributing all possible evils and crimes to a single reform. Prohibition has not increased our disrespect for law; it has merely revealed it. It has not created the bootlegger; it has transferred him from one field of activity to another equally vicious. He would have been a bootlegger of sorts without prohibition. It has not created the wild party of the high school girl or boy; it has served to emphasize the negligence of parents and given the viewers-with-alarm a megaphone. There is no revolt of youth; rather youth is following the example set out by elders, and seeing themselves as others see them, these same elders howl with rage. One of the most valuable results of the whole prohibition movement is the opportunity forced upon us to sit off and look at our own imbecility.

### III

If the foregoing discussion has dealt somewhat at length with the destructive phases of our political and social energies it has had a three-fold purpose.

First, it is important to emphasize the fact that the masses in this young nation, for the first time in the history of mankind, has secured full political powers and exercised the sovereignty of the State, without bloodshed, or even any hint of disturbance from any quarter. By the grace of full constitutional approval the reins of government slipped into the hands of the common people.

Second, popular rule in America at its worst, has proved to be infinitely better than the best part of revolution by force of arms. This popular rule includes absolute freedom of worship, which alone in France, Ireland, England, Spain, and Italy, to name only a few, cost years of bloodshed, agony of inquisition, and debasement of morals. It includes full judicial and political liberty, the securing of which parallels the struggle for religious freedom. People who have to throw off the yoke of tyranny by force of arms, either of a monarch or an oligarchy, practice the same tyranny on their victims that was practiced on them. In fighting tyranny they became tyrannical; in fighting the devil they parody his methods. Witness the French Revolution and the massacres which followed! Or the Russian Revolution of 1917, with its horrors and orgies! Witness England under Cromwell, or Rome under Sulla!

Third, since the American people are beginning to realize fully their responsibility for such evils as exist; that the autocrats which John Voter has to fight are John Voter and his neighbors, they are searching out and applying correctives which are not spectacu-

lar but in the long view of governmental and social welfare will be effective.

Those critics of America who are ardently suffering either from short vision or from indigestion need only compare conditions today with those in England under Robert Walpole, or Nicholas I of Russia, or Louis XIV in France. Weichenden thinks that "one has only to contrast the economic statecraft of a Hoover or a MacDonald with the dynastic intrigues of a Henry VIII, to realize how profoundly altered are the controlling forces of civilization."

One significant change is in progress in America which is decidedly favorable to popular government. This change is silent but powerful; subtle and deep-moving, constantly and irresistibly raising the level of popular statecraft. In short that change is the waning influence of the political orator and the newspaper's highly colored political editorial. More and more does the intelligent voter listen respectfully to some harangue, or read a patently biased editorial, then quietly goes about his business of finding out facts for himself. He goes to experts in various fields, to intellectuals, for his information. He has learned to distinguish between the demagogue and the statesman, the quack and the expert. The widespread use of factual material, analysis, and use of the printed appeal has engendered a critical attitude which is all for the good. We see disputation as mere wrangling. The modern student resorts to observation, experiment, cold analysis, measurement, and record. His methods are employed in attacking the problems of the mind, the government, and society.

There is good reason, according to Ross,<sup>44</sup> why people more and more forsake the demagogue and listen to intellectuals outside of public life—university presidents, inventors, scholars, philanthropists, and captains of industry—and less to the parliamentary orator. “Owing to the clamor of each locality to have its own man in the legislature, the law-making body is so large that only by courtesy can it be called ‘deliberative.’ It is there to register the will, and this function keeps it bigger than any thinking group should be. It includes too many who are inert, or who talk buncombe for the folks back home. The thinking members themselves are vitiated. Before an assembly so large they fire off ‘speeches of the lamp,’ which so poorly focus upon the issues developed in discussion that opponents glide past each other like locomotives on parallel tracks. They are tempted to oratory, the foe of logic, and to partisan debate, the foe of reasonableness. Candor well-nigh perishes, for it is harder to recede or accept correction before hundreds than before tens. Hence the ‘House’ limits itself to ultimate decisions, while the hammering of laws into shape goes on in small committees of a dozen men or less.

“The democratic-looking proposal to make all committee sessions public is a proposal to hunt frank and fruitful discussions from their last refuge in capitols. The barrenness of the average full-dress legislative debate is due to pose, the participants addressing not their fellow members, but a less enlightened outside public. Instead of candid man-to-man talk, we get claptrap and sparring for party advantage. Public-

ity would introduce a like insincerity into committee discussions and oblige the majority representatives to talk matters over informally in advance in order to clarify their minds before the curtain went up."

A summary of two recent Congresses separated by only a few years will serve to indicate the tendency toward a more intelligent appreciation of the real function and opportunity of public bodies. There is a definite trend toward a smaller percentage of lawyers and corporation attorneys and an increase of educators, newspaper men, farmers, and other groups based on a definite occupational basis. The range of occupations widens. In the Sixty-fifth Congress we find the following picture:

### HOUSE—435 MEMBERS

#### TRAINING—

College Education	291	67 %
Public, parochial, High School	135	31.2
Not listed	9	1.8
Total	435	100.0%

#### OCCUPATIONS—

Lawyers	306	69.1%
Business Men and Manufacturers	90	21.5
Newspapermen	16	3.6
Farmers	6	1.8
Salesmen and Clerks	5	1.2
Laborers	4	.9
Educators	3	.7
Ministers of the Gospel	2	.5
Physicians	2	.5
Social Workers	1	.2
Total	435	100.0%

## SENATE—96 MEMBERS

## TRAINING—

College	76	78.1%
High School	16	17.6
Not listed	4	4.3

---

Totals	96	100.0%
--------	----	--------

## OCCUPATIONS—

Lawyers	74	78.1%
Business Men	8	8.1
Newspaper Men	8	8.1
Farmers	3	3.1
Physicians	2	1.8
Bankers	1	.8

---

Totals	96	100.0%
--------	----	--------

For the Seventy-first Congress there is a very noticeable increase in the number of college-trained men, and not only men with college training but those who have made a profession of educational work. The number of lawyers and business men have decreased. There is also a more inclusive occupational range.

## HOUSE—435 MEMBERS

## TRAINING—

College Education	336	77.3%
High School	90	20.7
Not listed	9	2.0

---

Totals	435	100.0%
--------	-----	--------

## OCCUPATIONS—

Lawyers	245	56.3%
Business Men and Manufacturers	53	12.2
Educators	37	8.5
Bankers	21	4.8
Newspapermen, Editors, etc.,	16	3.7
Farmers and Stockraisers	10	2.4
Government Officials	9	2.0
Army Officers	9	2.0
Politicians, Real Estate	8	1.8
Doctors, Surgeons	5	1.3
Engineers	2	.5
Railroaders	2	.5
Housewives	2	.5
Carpenters	2	.5
Music Directors	1	.2
Labor Organizers	1	.2
Actors	1	.2
Aviators	1	.2
Ministers of the Gospel	1	.2
Not Classified	9	2.0
Totals	435	100.0%

## SENATE—96 MEMBERS

## TRAINING—

College Education	83	86.4%
High School	13	13.6
Totals	96	100.0%

## OCCUPATIONS—

Lawyers	58	60.4%
Newspapermen, Editors, etc.	8	8.3
Bankers	8	8.3
Business Men, Manufacturers	5	5.3
Educators	4	4.2
Farmers	4	4.2
Government Officials	3	3.1
Army Officers	2	2.1
Engineers	2	2.1
Politicians	1	.9
Authors	1	.9
Totals	96	100.0%

In both the matter of outstanding leaders as well as the general average, in Congress and all public offices, the level of ability and honesty of purpose is gradually rising. In the last half-dozen Congresses there was more actual liberalism and progressivism, less bossism, more independence in thinking and acting, more constructive statesmanship, than could have been found in any similar period in our past. One only has to contrast such demagogues as the "war hawks" who are generally credited with bringing about the War of 1812, after most of the reason for it had vanished, in order to annex Canada, or the machinations of a Martin Van Buren, or the bossism of Quay, Penrose, or Hanna, or the Tweed regime, with the independent spirit and statesmanship of a Roosevelt, Wilson, Hoover, and many outstanding leaders in Congress, to realize what tremendous gains we have made both in personnel and methods of government. And these gains have been reflected in a more stable and responsive government and in a greater degree of individual responsibility.

#### IV

The Aristotelean theory of governments taught us that there is a definite cycle of change in the expression of sovereignty of the State. Monarchy is the first manner of expression and at first it is a fair and just rule, but gradually power "goes to the head" of the monarch and his rule degenerates into one of arrogance, selfishness, and oppression—Despotism. A reform wave or revolution levels the despotism and



sets up, by force of arms, a government of a few enlightened nobles who rule wisely in the name of Aristocracy. After a period the aristocracy becomes corrupt and degenerates into an Oligarchy, a rule of spoliation by the same few but no longer for the benefit of the State. Oligarchy is finally overthrown by the people and a Democracy (Aristotle's name for mob rule) begins to assume power. But the common people not members of the mob government soon become suspicious and the machinations of the upper classes result in the overthrow of Democracy. Inevitably democracy (Aristotle's type) reverts to Monarchy, thus starting the cycle all over again. And all these changes were always accompanied or actually achieved through revolution and blood.

Aristotle's democracy meant an unruly and illiterate mob, uncouth, boorish, cruel—the Lower and Middle Classes. Unfortunately a good many people hold the same views today that Aristotle held some centuries before the Christian era—that the common people are unfit for “home rule,” for they are uncultured, crude, docile, unimaginative, bigoted, and above all, intolerant. They set idealistic standards of morals for the literati to rail at. They want to control other people's conduct. They consider themselves missionaries to the world. They are the foes of freedom and license, therefore the enemy of everything that is precious in the world. But call the roll of famous poets, statesmen, artists, writers, musicians, and you will find such products of the “common people” as Dickens, Riley, Shakespear, Poe,

Lincoln, Lindberg, Corot, Columbus, Keats, Hugo, Balzac, Handel, Milton, Whitman, Beethoven, Gainsborough, Booth, Patti, Lind, Edison, Wilson, Pasteur; such great mass reforms of the Middle Classes as the Reformation. Industrial Revolution, League of Nations, World Court, Renaissance, and the Abolition of Slavery.

It is incorrect therefore to think of democracy as a form of government which can be adopted at will; it must be a growth of spirit and intellect. Lennes believes that democracy "refers to a whole system of relations in which the individuals are given as nearly as maybe, equal opportunities and responsibilities. The 'Spirit of Democracy' consists, then, of a body of ideals and aims whose end is the creation of social conditions that make for such a quality." We may agree, therefore, that democracy is a theory of social progress. It is the expression of an entire people in their attempt to reach forward toward the pure light of a perfect social adjustment; to set free the noble impulses of the common level of humanity from the domination and restrictive influences of self-constituted leaders; it is a state of mind, the spirit in which thoughts are conceived and applied. It is a mistake to say that democracy is solely a form of government. We can have democracy in a monarchical form, or autocracy and tyranny in a republican form of government.

But practical experience has furnished convincing evidence that a state of democracy is more easily realized under one form of government than under

another. Precisely what will be the final form under which the most nearly perfect democracy can be realized may be many generations in the future, and one would be indeed reckless to hazard a prediction as to its ultimate type or time. One thing is certain: democracy cannot be realized through ignorance, stupidity, or indifference; it cannot be brought about through negation nor without some positive governing force. It must come as a continuous and constant adjustment and co-ordination of social forces. Since the time absolute monarchs ruled, ostensibly by divine right, the struggle has ever been the many against the few. The doctrine of divine right was possible only when the great mass of the people were ignorant and superstitious. Simultaneously with the spread of intelligence, came the long arduous struggle of the masses in every country against the small dominant ruling class. When the struggle reached the new world the same forces were everywhere evident; the bulk of the population in opposition to the few to make the political organization and policy of the state a complete and accurate expression of the popular will.

One of the absurd by-products of democracy, according to its critics, is feminism. "Strong men, pounding their chests, will laugh and denounce; Mussolini shows how absurd it is; but it must be amusing, at least to these virile persons, to recall that the World War, supposed to demonstrate manly valor at its highest pitch, accelerated the movement for woman suffrage. Nearly all the new states created

after the conflict confer on women the right to vote; to be specific, Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Finland, Lithuania, Poland, and Russia. About the same time England and the United States joined Denmark, Sweden, and the Netherlands in proclaiming equal suffrage.

"And unless some masterful genius can blindfold the women, take them out of the factories, offices, schools, universities, and theaters, make them illiterate once more, and back them into the kitchen and the cow barn again, feminism is likely to increase rather than diminish. Indeed, if the women were suddenly removed from the offices of any modern government with a view to a restoration of 'the home and the fireside' the confusion would be so great that the first call on the morning after would be for feminine help. Not even man's grand game, war, now that it has become chemical and mechanical, can be carried on without enrolling armies of women. No, the feminist genie is out of the bottle; it may be changed with time and circumstance; but the work of getting it back into the non-refillable container passes the imagination." <sup>45</sup>

Even those diligent whisker-hunters, hot on the trail of the Bolsheviki, have lost their enthusiasm; the Russian spy Gobble-uns have ceased to raise goose flesh up and down our spine; Mussolini can't even produce a shudder on this side of the Atlantic. The plain facts are that those who professed to see the early demise of American democracy are nothing less than poor analysts and hypnotized prophets. In

what part of the world is there an inviting example for America to follow?

There are many forces, reagents, which acting together, form a precipitant in this constant whirl of human matter. It is a collection of realities and conditions that have grown out of industrialism and science; out of the decay of feudalism. Its growth has paralleled that of schools, newspapers, printing, modern transportation and communication—in short, the whole rapid spread of ideas. But when we review the colossal strides made by science and technology, the endless array of inventions, material comforts, luxuries and wealth, then compare the slow progress made in the science of government, we are in a mood to blame democracy and all its shortcomings for not keeping abreast of the times. We forget for the moment that science has no master; no public opinion to be mobilized to support its tenets; no compromises and political straddling to gain votes. It is direct in its methods. Its only concern is: are all the relevant facts in or accounted for?; not will the result arising from those facts win popular approval? It is guided neither by sentiment nor expediency. But government by popular will must proceed slowly and with great caution. Brilliant leaders frequently move too swiftly and lose contact with those being led. Those leaders who are somewhat short of being geniuses must be depended upon in governmental leadership. Any policy that comes up for consideration in a democracy must proceed only so fast as public opinion approves. To say that the science of

government has not kept pace in its progress with technological development and the advances of the machine age is everywhere admitted, but that in no wise suggests that democracy is doomed. Quite the reverse is true. It moves slowly to avoid certain defeat, the defeat that so often has overtaken the seven-league boots of benevolent despots. Democratic government has learned to depend on science to lead the way. Science must form the bodyguard of government, preceding it, darting hither and yon into obscure pathways to reveal hidden dangers or possible aids, lighting up dark passages, preparing and making safe the way for the advancing machine of popular will.



•

PART FIVE

EDUCATION

•



.

*The proper task of education is to broaden the interests and sympathies of people regardless of their daily occupation—or along with it—to lift men's thoughts out of the monotony and drudgery which are the common lot, to free the mind from servitude and herd opinion, to train habits of judgment and appreciation of value, to carry on the struggle for human excellence in our day and generation, to temper passion with wisdom, to dispel prejudice by better knowledge of self, to enlist all men, in the measure that they have capacity for it, in the achievement of civilization.*

*Everett Dean Martin.*

.

## PART FIVE

### EDUCATION

#### I

IN ANY discussion of education, its present status or future outlook, one is at once confronted with the necessity of considering numerous conditions which make predictions of the future of education in America extremely hazardous.

During that thought-troubled decade following the Great War education and the approaches to it suffered many changes, attacks, and criticisms which have tended to impress upon us the chaos prevailing among educational leaders, their plans and policies, but they have also tended to increase our faith in education as the only sound foundation of an enduring democracy. Our nation was founded and has endured upon faith in popular sovereignty as a means of giving wider distribution to the powers and privileges of organized society among its members. But popular sovereignty is impossible without an effective development of the abilities of the individuals who compose that society. The effectiveness of popular governments rises and falls with the competency of the school system.

No nation before ours has ever attempted on a national scale to force all elements of society to acquire the tools of learning, from "the gutter to the university." But such has been our faith in the "value" of education (schooling) that the public insists on burdening the schools with an ever increasing load of duties that touch every phase of modern life. The public has found a new device, a new plaything with which to amuse itself, and until recently has not cared to count the cost. Schools exist as parking places for children and to teach Arithmetic, Safety First, Savings, Boxing, Tumbling, "General Science", Latin, History, Marketing, Nursing, Agriculture, Carpentry, Geography, Hygiene, Journalism, and Poultry Raising. Classical learning has been left behind. Today's school is a far cry from the older concept of education as a process of mental discipline and intellectual enrichment. Perhaps the very fact of growth makes it inevitable! Perhaps it's best! At any rate the subject will bear further examination.

## II

American civilization is an assembled civilization with its component parts brought from every corner of the earth, put together with some degree of unity and painted in attractive colors. It is not a process of orderly organized growth. Without a unity of tradition the various parts of former cultures, civilizations, and education-patterns have achieved some rough articulation but unity remains to be con-

sciously thought out and consciously directed. All programs of education have to be built with these conditions in view. A program put together by one element or with one function in view fails to reach the interest of other groups. Based primarily upon advancing machine civilization schools have more and more adopted the economic or utilitarian point of view. This course or that subject must justify itself in its promise to increase the learner's economic worth to society. He must learn in order to earn, in order to save money and accumulate luxuries. Thus some part of education's program must continually be "sold" to the public.

Ancient education was designed primarily for the small leisure class who had time for speculation and abstract meditation; who had the time and inclination to make conversation an art. It permitted one to take a detached view of life about him, to stand aloof and watch the great rumbling stream of life go by. He frequently became a part of that stream but he could also stand aside and philosophize about its destiny. Education was a class possession, a training for the conventional gentleman. The common rabble remained untouched by it except insofar as the Church slowly assumed the function of school in a manner that would strengthen its hold on the lowly. Educational programs, therefore, in those days were, in the light of today's complexities, comparatively simple affairs.

Within the last generation we have been transformed from an essentially rural, agricultural nation

to an urbanized nation. We've not only urbanized the population by moving them to the city but have partially urbanized the country by making the comforts and influences of city life accessible to the rural population. Despite this change, however, the bulk of the schools have remained distinctly agrarian in character, in administration, and in vision. Their functions have been charged alike with the duty of making education "pay" in terms of better material living. "To the average, intelligent American," says Mr. Ludwig Lewisohn, "education, for which he is willing to deny himself and pay taxes, means skill and information—at most accomplishment. Skill and knowledge with which to conquer the world of matter. It does not mean to him an inner change—the putting on of a new man, a new criterion of truth, new tastes and other values. The things he wants at the university are finer and more flexible tools for the economic war which he calls liberty . . . Our people do not believe in education at all—if education means a liberation of the mind or a heightened consciousness of the historic culture of mankind."

Thus education—the term is commonly used as synonymous with schooling, drill, training—has come to be largely by formula. Early attempts were made to superimpose our educational curriculums upon the classical foundations, but the movement died aborning. The humanities have been left to shift for themselves. Formulas of ancient wisdom have been tucked away to be used occasionally as ornaments but they have been of little use in evaluating life in mod-

ern tempo because of its swiftly changing environment. Modern education must constantly face the emergence of new industrial processes, new inventions, new values, and devices for speeding up the rhythm of life. Man now weighs the universe and splits the atom. He harnesses the electron and rides the ether on his search for the very source of power. He has abolished handicraft but has replaced one of its products with one thousand products of the machine, and somehow man must learn to use and pay for the surplus. Man has abolished feudalism and slavery, and not only pulled the masses loose from bondage but also in large degree has struck from under him the sense of safety and security which dependence upon the master gave him. Education is trying to replace this dependence with self-reliance; the safety of the feudal castle with an individual economic security. Ancient man found stolidity in the masses; men are stolid yet, but educational programs are built with the purpose of giving the man emerging from the mass tools and formulas and devices with which he may fix his own place and value in relation to the group. In this flux there is lacking a sense of continuity of culture and real education, but the elements of such cultural continuity, although they may be obscured for the present, are there nevertheless. Modern education hasn't produced the stolid type nor the mechanical, "chauffeur type"; it has only made us conscious of them.

Educators have made frequent use of some index or formula whereby the relative mental capacity of

members of a conglomerate group might be roughly determined. Whether one calls it the biologic curve or the asymmetric curve or the binomial graph, matters little, but in various ways it has been determined that in any random grouping, whether of a hundred humans or a million, they may be grouped with a rough accuracy, as follows:

A	B	C	D	E
5%	20%	50%	20%	5%

Five per cent, the A group, contains the brilliant minds, the creative artists, the philosophers, writers, inventors, and the so-called genuises. Five per cent at the opposite end of the scale, the E group, contains the unskilled, the stolid, the "dumbbells". The great middle class, the C group, drawing also from B and D groups, represent the average man. It is from this average that Keyserling's "chauffeur man" comes. Groups B, C, and D merge into each other and there can be no clear-cut division between them, but there is enough of difference to serve our purpose here.

Educators discovered nothing new in applying this table; they merely discovered how to evaluate what they already knew and to approach some hitherto unknown features of the task before them. They have not altered the intellectual status of man; they have only made an effort at understanding him. Neither biologically nor mentally do we appear to have changed much since the days when Cro-Magnon man shaped rude tools in his cave 20,000 years ago. If the biologic curve is true today, it was true then.

The five per cent in the A group through all these ages have furnished the leadership in the arts, in culture, and education. They have always formed the apex of the pyramid. They have been the probers into the secrets of the universe. They furnished the inspiration and leadership in the Renaissance, the Periclean Age, the Elizabethan Age, in Florence. But they've seldom held the reins of government.

Groups C, D, and E, embrace the mechanically-minded—those who follow. From these three groups, comprising perhaps eighty per cent of our population, comes the solid citizen, the practical merchant and business man, the electrician and the mechanic, the politician and the average lawyer, the skilled and the unskilled worker, the bourgeoisie and the bum, the job-holder type of preacher and teacher, and largely the personnel of our entire governmental machinery. Group A, and a part of B, furnishes specialists in numerous fields, creative artists of every nature, inventors, and the like, including a few first class cranks. It has been a practice in a democracy not to intrust the responsibilities of government to those of A group; they are too far removed from the base of the pyramid, and there might be a lack of sympathy. That seems to be a justifiable practice. It seems to be the better wisdom to man government agencies with members of the average group, the better to maintain sympathetic contact with all groups; with men who would be guided in the formulation of policies by specialists whenever needed. But to place full control in the hands of geniuses and specialists and experts would invite dizziness without progress.



## III

If Count Keyserling mourns what seems to him a tendency to place the "chauffeur type" at the wheel, he should remember that it has always been there. Only once in a very great while does a man from the A group stand at the controls. The exceptions only emphasize the broad prevalence of the general rule. Frequently in monarchies, limited or absolute, it has happened that persons who normally belonged in the lowest group have, by virtue of "noble birth", been placed in the highest seat of power. That such inferiors have been in places of power more frequently in dynasties than in democracies needs no proof other than a reference to history. The list is a long one. This, despite the fact that the small privileged and ruling classes have been in full possession exclusively of liberal learning and the amenities of culture the past centuries.

Education and cultural advantages thus enjoyed exclusively by the upper groups have gradually percolated downward through the intervening strata till they have reached bottom in America, where, for the first time in history, a serious nation-wide attempt is being made to give each individual, regardless of his classification, color, race, creed, or previous hereditary influences, an opportunity to participate in broad educational advantages. We are placing in the hands of every child, from the lowest to the highest on the list, the tools of learning, the mechanics of a utili-

tarian education and the elements of knowledge of social control. Obviously it is necessary to give the type of training to each group, or to the individuals who compose the group, that will best bring out what latent possibilities are there, and to develop them in the direction of their bent. The task of the educator is to locate the direction of the bent. However much people may differ as to the proper definition of education, or as to the merits of a purely classical education, one thing seems to need no proof further than its mere statement: that to give the same type of education to all groups is worse than futile. To drill the dullard of group E in the dead languages in the name of liberal education is absurd. To fit him by careful training to perform efficiently his part in the broad advance of society is the constant aim of education in a democracy.

"If the ordinary citizen will turn social scientist for a moment," says Suzzallo,<sup>48</sup> "the very elements of the subject will tell him at once that no nation can endure without authority, without the power to bring its members into conformity on matters essential to unity and life. In the tyrannies against which peoples of Anglo-Saxon culture have continuously revolted, that authority was determined by a few, and externally and coercively applied to the many. In the democracies which have been set up in their places the authority is that of a public opinion expressing the inner aspirations of the whole group. The discipline is one of willing individual conformity to the logic or principles personally held, rather

than one of obedience to the arbitrary command of persons in the strategic possession of political power. How else than through education can millions of men be given a common understanding, aspiration, and will, which together make the life of the republic a true, free, and effective co-operation!

“Successful schooling is worth all it costs and may be worth very much more than we are willing to pay, just because it is the safest and surest way of achieving the kind of lawful and orderly co-operations which are essential to the progress and happiness of free men and women. The American kind of government scarcely seems workable or preservable without widespread education.”

But liberal learning, the humanities, and highly cultural advantages have not been subtracted from our efforts in order to add more to the utilitarian studies. An advance has been made all along the line. More opportunities are open in our best universities, libraries, and centers of learning, than has been true of any other age or country, for students to drink deep and long from cultural springs. Increasing numbers are there who possess broad scholarship. But since they are no longer the privileged class drinking alone they attract less attention than their more numerous and perhaps noisier brothers hot in the pursuit of a broader participation in life. But to say that a deep liberal scholarship is passing out of America's possession is to state a poor case rather badly.

## IV

One phase of American education has seldom received the emphasis which its importance deserves—its long cohabitation with Puritanism. It is significant that organized religion, by whatever label a given sect may be known, has always kept a watchful eye full of jealousy on education. "We cannot understand the anomalous position of education today," says Martin, "unless we see clearly what happened to the classical tradition after the Renaissance. As should have been expected both Protestant and Catholic turned against the humanizing influences of Renaissance upon education. It was 'Pagan', 'Worldly', 'Anti-Christ'." "

As has been pointed out elsewhere in this work the Puritan, with his already rigid moral code made more harsh by the rigors of environment in a new world, was the first to establish colleges and schools in the New England states and in the ever-advancing frontier regions. Education was the poor man's approach to equality in a new land ruled by a new set of values. But the "classics" didn't satisfy the needs of a new civilization which demanded action and bread and protection from constant physical dangers. Gradually "more practical" subjects were introduced as shortcuts to an education that would fit the raw recruits of an unpolished environment to battle successfully with the forces which were pressing him on all sides. He must learn to be the engi-

neer and the chauffeur of the new machinery of State instead of becoming merely a subject, a vassal, a galley slave. The lord of the manor was no more; the old vassal was the new master. Then, too, a "practical" education would satisfy the learner's eagerness to rise to more opulent levels without raising the embarrassing questions frowned upon by a narrow church theology. Liberalism and humanism always raised questions. Education in the old sense of the word had become denatured.

But because of the circumstances peculiar to the untrammelled life in the American wilderness the influences of the Church, predominant at first, gradually declined. The State was compelled to take the initiative in dealing with Indian troubles and in dealing with foreign powers. The success of the State in these and in other matters strengthened its prestige and correspondingly weakened the influence of the Church. Likewise, the successful war for independence was a factor from the very beginning of our nation in making the State supreme and entirely separated from any ecclesiastical influence or function. At the same time it was recognized that an educated citizenry was the best guarantee of a sound popular government. And if the government was to foster the principle that equality of opportunity should prevail, how better could it be done than through universal education? And since America was a land of sectarian diversity how could equality of educational opportunity prevail free from the dictation of any particular church group unless the

State exercised sole control? Thus the school became a creature of the State and democracy a child of education.

Education is far older than schools. In early tribal days the elders were ever alert to pass to youth the tribal ways of behaving, tribal customs, culture, folk lore, and *mores*. This informal education was flexible, always ready to change with the habits of the tribe. When writing was invented and formal schools were established to perpetuate the art of writing, there was at once a tendency to institutionalize them. As schools, programs of formal education, curriculums, and educational procedure became institutionalized, they became at once instruments to serve the cause of the State, or to bolster up ambitions, moral standards, reform movements—ends that were entirely irrelevant. The original aim of the schools, aside from the duty of teaching reading and writing and “figures” became, therefore, to acquaint youth with the moral and social culture of the group. Traditions and group opinion looked to the schools for perpetuation and the schools thus became bulwarks of conservatism. They have resisted change. Unfortunately much of our school machinery is still geared to old habits of a fixed order.

But today traditions are being scrutinized as never before. Old formulas are being re-examined and all our social, political, and religious institutions are facing searching criticisms. Nothing escapes. The family and its place in society, governments, organized society, creedal religious orders, schools,

war, morals—all must face this minute searching-out process. To state the fact is easier than to answer the question, why? For one thing a more disciplined thought is in evidence; thought based upon tested rules and data. Since man has thrown off his anonymity and become a recognized personality, he has come to realize that the world and its institutions exist for him. No longer will he listen to the old doctrine that he exists solely for institutionalism. Having come to that conclusion he begins probing, criticising, judging, changing, remaking, until the law of change and growth becomes fixed. Society for its own sake, therefore, since the individual has become judge, demands that education increase the individual's ability to judge dispassionately, and that he bring about changes which mean growth rather than flux. Undisciplined, untested judging and thinking, uncritical attitudes, and a lack of standards, open the way for the demagogue.

Education, then, as a tool of Puritanism in America, or of the church in general, taught and practiced strict obedience to the established order, to autocracy. Democracy is not outward growth but inner control, and as the conception of democracy became more widespread and studied, educational practices and processes began to harmonize with democratic ideals. Formerly what the child learned had to do with the distant future; now he is learning to interpret and accept the present. Too frequently has he been taught that all childhood and school life only prepared him for some future greatness. Religion

was not supposed to be of any special value to him in this life except insofar as it prepared him for life after death. The standards which guided his learning and behaving were set up in the remote past. They were unchangeable and all-sufficient. The goals in the future were fixed and the roads thereto well marked.

## V

But external authority is giving way before man inquisitive. The ferment of change since frontier days has been growing and expanding, till now nothing is too sacred or fixed for the individual to inquire into. He is searching for values in a civilization in which the standards of values are constantly changing. Since many ancient values and standards have been discarded, the goals fixed for the future have also disappeared or undergone striking changes.

Old moral certainties are passing; likewise moral standards and authorities. New ones are being built up, but in the resulting confusion some profess to see a negation of all morals. Similarly old political concepts and ethical codes have shifted to a new center of gravity, inspiring some to see impending chaos.

The tendency in popular governments everywhere is to a more real democracy. But a larger degree of outward freedom without a corresponding inner control merely increases the vast stream of social energy



without deepening the channel. It is the task of education to keep that stream of energy properly disciplined. That there are elements of chaos in our present educational outlook is only too apparent, but the ray of hopefulness is to be found in the knowledge that many educators and laymen know the reason for our halting progress and are devising remedies.

Among many other reasons for the sluggishness of our public school system is the comparatively low standards of scholarship. This of course is readily understandable when it is recalled that popular education in the United States, like popular government, has been in the hands of ordinary laymen, relatively uncultured, who think of literacy as being synonymous with learning. To them an elaborate system of professional training has seemed an unjustifiable expenditure of money.

If the American school system, if indeed it can be called a "system," had its concern centered solely in group A of our population educational procedure would be a more simple and direct task. Or if, as in other ages and countries, education concerned itself only with that small group more fortunately embedded in economic security and able to buy the ornaments which liberal learning and culture are supposed to furnish, many administrative burdens in our school practices would be unknown. Such, however, is our faith in the ultimate rightness of democracy in government, and our conviction that

democracy demands a universal possession of facts and skills and attitudes that we have undertaken the systematic schooling of every child. Thus, there are thrown together in one small school building children representing home and racial and cultural backgrounds antipodal in diversity. They represent possibly every group in our intelligence curve, yet we must somehow "educate" them. Since the schools are the direct concern of the State, that is, John Taxpayer and his cousins in every locality who must furnish the funds, it follows that John Taxpayer wants a hand in the guidance of his community's school organization. He may be poorly trained himself and utterly lacking in the genius of school procedure, nevertheless he must be reckoned with. Most students of local school organizations the country over, see, despite occasional lapses to the contrary, a rapid improvement. To a surprising degree the schools of America are being dominated increasingly by the more sympathetic and favored groups in every community. Since the ultimate control of school machinery is in the hands of the voters it isn't surprising that occasionally a vulgar political ring will utterly wreck an efficient school system to satisfy ugly and selfish motives. Chicago under Mayor Thompson furnishes a well-known example of bringing opprobrium and disgrace upon the very thought of popular education. One of Chicago's suburbs, Glen Ellyn, furnishes a more recent and more heart-breaking example, though less well-known, of how

a vicious political ring can destroy faith in the whole system of public education. These examples, though tragic in themselves, only bring into bold relief the many thousands of fine community enterprises maintained in the name of education.

The sons and daughters of the banker, the baker, and the candlestick maker mingle together on equal terms, receive a similar elementary education, and in later years conduct the many organizations of city and state. In our scheme of social organization no one person or group can furnish the leadership all the time. Today the baker's son leads and the banker's son follows; tomorrow the son of the candlestick maker furnishes the leadership and the baker's son follows. In a democracy intelligent followship is quite as important as intelligent leadership. Both must be fostered by the intelligent masses. "Thus every democratic citizen's life is a chain of moments in some of which he initiates and leads and in some of which he appreciates and follows. Like varicolored beads these moments follow each other with a sequence determined by his own abilities, the powers of men about him, and the peculiar tasks which confront the human company.

"This doctrine of alternate leadership is consonant with the current spirit of justice and efficiency. It posits the manner in which an efficient and happy democracy must organize and work. Likewise it lays out the functions of the educational system, more particularly the schools, which are the chief instruments for the realization of an alternating leadership

among men. Each man shall be schooled to wise action; to the power of initiative and proposal and to the wisdom of appreciation and acceptance; to devoted leadership where one is most fit, and to loyal followship where one is less fit.

"Schooling with us must be universal. It must reach every human being. Schooling must be advanced. It must develop unusual or special ability wherever it appears and as far as it will be taken." <sup>48</sup>

On the road from kindergarten to university many roads turn aside. After the first six or eight years beyond kindergarten some turn to gainful occupations, some to conventional high schools, or to technical, vocational industrial secondary schools. Beyond that many go to work and many go to college. Beyond college a still smaller number go to "Universities" or do independent research work. Many who do not go beyond the first college degree devote themselves to creative work of various kinds and may be properly classed with the scholar or research student, but whether they do research or creative work in or out of college they correspond roughly to that group in ages past known as the favored leisure class in whom reposed "culture." All the remaining groups lower down the scale, who in democracy, received various grades and degrees of education acquired skills in accordance with their bent and have happily become integrated in the complex machinery of popular government, would formerly have constituted that great mass who were stolid brothers of "The Man With the

Hoe." While they are still in large degree hewers of wood and drawers of water—as indeed is the scholar and the creative artist—their conditions of daily life are infinitely better. And in contrast with former ages the roads upward are still open. Irrespective of the point at which an individual began or ended his formal schooling there are no restrictions, other than mental limitations, on his advance from one condition to another.

On a given day in September two or three million children six years of age begin school under similar conditions, learn the same words at the same time, practice writing and numbers in identically the same fashion. At the end of six or seven years in school, whether in Maine or Mexico, Chicago or California, they will all have learned approximately the same facts and skills. Some argue from that point that all our children are cast in the same mould, standardized, and touched alike by the bogey of uniformity. That is a polite straining at the gnat. One cannot standardize a brilliant mind any more than one can individualize a dullard. Nor has any one, so far as I know, produced a single piece of authoritative data as evidence that our school system moulds character and mind into colorless uniformity. In fact quite the reverse is true. The serious attempts being made by educators the country over to apply the pressure of "learning" to individual needs form a sluice gate through which human material must be fluid to pass, and in passing through is further separated and

started functioning in such way as to prevent any noticeable stratification or standardization. True, the schools are used as a powerful bulwark of support for our entire social structure. One of its functions is to strengthen faith in democratic institutions and to inculcate pride in the manner in which America is committed to the democratic way of life. And there is a widespread belief that that pride is justified. In 1900 approximately a half-million boys and girls were enrolled in American high schools; in 1930 that number had been multiplied by ten. Since the World War colleges and universities have experienced growth at a similar rate of increase so that today there is scarcely a first rate institution of learning in the land which is not congested almost to suffocation. This profound upward surge of the mass to higher levels is motivated by a desire everywhere apparent to gain a greater degree of industrial success, both financially and in terms of greater participation in group affairs and in social recognition. The more firmly committed to the benefits of education become the masses the more determined they are to perpetuate the type of governmental control which makes such achievements possible.

We might as well be perfectly frank and admit that much of this individual effort is selfish. We have tried by various slogans and devices to make ourselves believe in manual labor; to convince ourselves that it is in every way admirable. From the housetops we've preached the gospel of labor, all the while re-

membering that it was ever the method of the privileged classes to glorify "honest labor"—for the poor man—to anaesthetize him into an unquestioned acceptance of his lot. We've uttered encomiums and written panegyrics on the dignity of hard labor—all the time with our fingers crossed. We don't believe it; neither does the laborer. Not only does he not believe it but he is getting away from it as rapidly as he can. And as he mounts the steps out of it the machine takes his place, does the work infinitely better than he did and releases him for work that has less of drudgery. By virtue of the advance he also earns more, works less, has a greater sense of security, dignity, and of belonging to a real brotherhood. All of which, of course, means that the lot of the common man is rapidly improving. In such circumstances it isn't surprising that there is an absence in America of any considerable revolutionary temper among the masses. They will listen to no revolutionary doctrine which offers to disturb their progress upwards. No obstacles have been placed in the way of those who formerly would have been members of the small privileged classes; no attempt has been made to block their advance; the obstacles merely have been removed from the road of the lower mass and its advance has drawn the fire of some critics on the ground that it gave the appearance of being regimented and standardized and lacking in color.

To an amazing degree child and adult alike are touched by a thousand influences calculated to stimulate his curiosity, satisfy his thirst for knowledge, en-

rich his imagination, and prick him to an alertness to the whole new world about him. The opportunities for self-development constitute one of the greatest advances in our educational programs. Never has there been so much information on every conceivable subject at his command as there is today. America is building a broad cultural foundation for its future growth. There are nearly seven thousand free public libraries in the United States with the impressive total of 155,000,000 volumes in circulation, exclusive of the many traveling libraries organized to carry reading matter to remote rural sections outside the range of the city library. This does not include the many private or semi-private libraries which supplement the work of the public institutions, nor does it indicate the tremendous sale of new books made every year to individuals who can afford private ownership or prefer purchase rather than the use of the public library.

One year's output of new books by the publishers furnishes a rough index of the extent of the reading public and the type of material read. The following table is worthy of study for the light it sheds on tastes of the reading public. Next to fiction and poetry the field of greatest attraction embraced works of a serious nature—religion, science, sociology, history, biography. This list constitutes the books published in 1925 in the United States and of course does not embrace the amount of serious reading in monthly magazines, technical bulletins from universities, government departments, foundations, and the like.



SUBJECTS	TITLES
Fiction	1331
Religion	885
Poetry and Drama	800
Science	670
Sociology	597
Biography	561
Juvenile	557
Technology	481
History	469
Geography	438
General Literature	419
Medicine and Health	326
Business	286
Philosophy	276
Philology	260
Education	248
Law	187
Fine Arts	175
Agriculture	168
Games and Sports	150
Music	89
Domestic Economy	53
Miscellaneous	58
Total	9,484

Aside from the large volume of technical and factual bulletins sent out from the Federal Bureaus and Departments at Washington, health boards, colleges and universities, there were approximately 2300 daily papers, 5000 monthlies, and 13,500 weeklies. The circulation of morning papers were nearly 13,000,000, and the evening papers were about 22,000,000 copies daily.<sup>49</sup>

This great flood of reading material does not all mean in every detail a spread of enlightenment and

education, and some of it no doubt is positively harmful, but the fields to choose from does furnish the serious minded an opportunity to enlarge his store of knowledge, to broaden his vision, and to stimulate his cultural tendencies, while to the average man who might not otherwise come in contact with the printed page it is an advanced step in social integration and induces a feeling of kinship with the universe which he never before became conscious of.

As an indication of the manner in which our public schools help to break down, or prevent stratification, serve the worthy, and give free play to talent instead of class, it is worthy of mention, as summed up by Ross, that among 885 leading American men of science, a fifth are sons of farmers. Among a thousand men of letters, a seventh came from the farms and a twentieth are sons of men in mechanical, clerical or unskilled occupations. Of our Presidents a half came from the farmer, laborer, and humble professional families. Of the 45 state governors in 1909, 41 were sons of farmers or plain people. Of members of Congress at the same time, 69 per cent were country bred. Of 56 cabinet officers from 1869-1903, 47 were from the farms. Of 47 railway presidents, more than a half have been country boys. Of 18,356 notables in WHO'S WHO IN AMERICA, 23.4 per cent were sons of farmers, 6.3 per cent were sons of skilled workers, and 0.4 per cent were sons of common laborers.

No one seriously contends that this unprecedented surge of the masses to the schools is to result in every

individual becoming a scholar. Nor is he expected to become an example of high culture and intellectual prowess, but it comes much nearer producing a civilized individual, a reasonable creature, than all the previous attempts which were directed at controlling the thought and actions of the subjects in order to perpetuate dogma or dynasty. We aim at inner development and individual self-control. The goal of modern education is to break down preordained sets of habits and attitudes, and to set the individual free to the extent that he may think and decide for himself, without the warp of prejudice and selfishness; to enrich his personality by making it his own instead of a colorless reflection of some stilted, ready thought-out manner of life.

In short, the liberal education, toward which the American democracy is driving, and with some success, aims to inculcate in the larger numbers that come out of the mass not only more skills but a wider field for the employment of those skills. It wants to help him achieve a degree of inner freedom which is the first fruit and final justification of all education. This inner freedom means a free mind in a free man, thinks Glenn Frank. What is the nature of this free mind?

The free mind of a free man which the spirit of education in a democracy nurses to maturity knows no loyalty save loyalty to the truth which it seeks to see clearly in the dry light of facts.

The free mind of a free man resists enslavement to passion and to prejudice, bringing to the bar of dis-

interested judgment the pleas of all parties and all powers, and tirelessly searches out the motives that coin the catch-words of all classes, all cliques, all clans.

The free mind of a free man turns a deaf ear alike to democracy when it grows sentimental and to plutocracy when it grows selfish.

The free mind of a free man is independent alike of tyrannical majorities and tirading minorities if it happens that the truth abides in neither.

The free mind of a free man inspires its motives with sincerity and informs its methods with science.

The free mind of a free man, when called to positions of power, is never guilty of saying the things that will please rather than the things that are true.

The free mind of a free man serves the crowd without flattering it and believes in it without bowing to its idolatries.

Thus education sets up new goals for itself in a democracy.



•

PART SIX

ART AND LITERATURE

•

*For all our crudeness, our ignorance, our materialism, for all the faults of the rawness of our culture, we bear within our national fiber, the stuff of a great literature. In our culture and our society, in the exuberance of our materialistic life and our deep need for spiritual employments, an intellectual situation is arising which, if wisely grasped, will inevitably result in such a literature.*

*William A. Drake.*

## PART SIX

### ART AND LITERATURE

#### I

So FAR as art and literature may be considered indexes of the status of our American culture and civilization it is as necessary to review ancestry and antecedent conditions as it is to observe offspring. The roots of our literature, our art—using the term in its broadest application—as well as our religion, are deeply embedded in the ancient Mediterranean world of Greece and Rome. The citizen of England, or of the continental European nations, feels a close kinship with the Past; the Past is at the back door and its influences are ever present. It is only a step to the literary and culture treasure house of early Greece and Rome. There is a continuity of civilization and culture from the earliest sources through devious modifications in different ages to the present. Through the Renaissance, through the Middle Ages, the unifying influences of the Catholic church has produced in the Germans, the English, the Italians, and French only variants of one fundamental mode. They are the direct heirs and possessors of older cultures.



The oneness of that cultural tradition, together with the soil and environment in which it grew, produced a heritage which the European had to renounce when he crossed the Atlantic; the continuity was snapped. The early colonist brought with him only a few pictures and these, for the most part, were portraits of ancestors and therefore of little value except for their historical significance. Since the early colonists were almost exclusively of the poorer elements, adventurers, or pious religionists, the craftsman, the artist, the original minds, were painfully few. His architecture was mainly utilitarian and copied from the books and after the fashions of England. As in architecture so it was in furniture, but as prosperity came Puritan austerity became modified and the better classes began to satisfy their innate love of ornament and beauty by a greater display of ornate furniture. It went through various styles and periods in harmony with English styles, from that of William and Mary to Queen Anne to Chippendale, and so on.

Everywhere the narrow and rigid precepts of the dominant Puritanism made their influence felt upon colonial life and early attempts at creative work reflect its blighting atmosphere. But such art and literature as developed soon entered its decline for reasons clearly understandable; reasons that are concomitant with those of the decline of dignity in government. If the Federalist regime had not been so absorbed in the fortunes of political opportunism of the new national government, native painters might have found greater encouragement. But the Wash-

ington and Hamilton leadership was too concerned in the problems inherent in conflicts between various sections of a wild and unorganized country to give ear to young artists. Southern planters were extending their holdings both in plantations and in slaves, the freeholders of the West were hard to hold in leash, and the manufacturing and money-lending East was growing more jealous and disturbed at the growth of the other sections. Their quarrels were centered in the political arena and demanded the eye of governmental leaders. There was little likelihood of getting state patronage, and none of a predominantly Puritan church. Moreover there were extremely few rich families possessing a bent for art; too few to provide even a modest market for the work of the artist.

The decline in early American art was rooted in the conditions inherent in a new country, was further accentuated in the reign of Jefferson, and touched bottom with the election and administration of Jackson. The old political structure, carefully built up and dominated by the élite of the nation, which radiated from the Federalist philosophy, received its initial defeat in 1800, and a quarter of a century later was completely shattered by the rising power of the West. Jackson represented a new section of the country and a new political philosophy. With Jackson came the motley group of office seekers. Everywhere the offices of the nation were filled, not by those trained to rule by long apprenticeship in public office, but whose only qualification for high office was that they had helped Jackson. The crude, the blatant,

the swaggerer held the stage and the quiet, cultured soul was crowded out of the main tent to make room for those attracted by the swaggerer.

Then "in 1828 died Gilbert Stuart, last American exponent of the eighteenth-century tradition in art. The period of transition was over; a new era was opened definitely in American life and it was here officially. It was the era of dynamic activity; of sharp political conflict among three major economic interests—the rapidly industrializing North, the slave-owning, cotton-growing South, and the pioneering, speculating hordes that were pouring into the unsettled western regions—of annexation and expansion, of immigration; of one foreign war and many brushes with the Indians on the frontier; of popular movements, political, religious, and economic; of wildcat speculation and financial panics; a period, in Emerson's words, of 'madmen and women, men with beards, Dunkers, Muggletonians, Come-outers, Groaners, Agrarians, Seventh-day Baptists, Quakers, Abolitionists, Unitarians, and Philosophers.' It was also an era of unprecedented material development; of railways, steamships, factories; of multiplying mechanical inventions that ushered in profound changes in the economic life and the social organization. And from the application of the mechanical processes of production to the apparently unlimited natural resources of a new country, flowed such a stream of wealth as the world had never known, giving prosperity and leisure to classes that had never before possessed a great amount of either." <sup>50</sup>

This era of Jackson and "King Mob" ushered in the years, extending well through the Civil War period which, in many respects, may be termed the American Dark Ages. The classification might be more apt, however, if the analogy did not fail in so many vital places. If the humanities were overshadowed by a multitude of more vulgar interests, if social amenities were roughly pushed aside, if the gentleman and his lady lost caste, if the powdered wig was bowed out by the coon-skin cap, it was an assembled civilization placing first things first. It was only weaning time for a new nation. It was the incubation period of a vast brood of Babbitts and Pollyannas, the adolescence of the original one-hundred percenter, and the senescence of the witch hunter.

In the thirty years from 1800 to 1830 the population of the country increased from five millions to nearly thirteen millions, and in the century following 1830 the population has been multiplied by ten, thereby furnishing a political and social expansion and experiment on a scale never before witnessed—truly an American saga. The determined struggle of these hordes, compact of every race, to share in the abundance of land and natural resources, developed to an unusual degree, an individualism among the masses, whetted their belief in the innate capacity of the average man, and created a surprising oneness in a new national allegiance. It was so easy for the individual to gain a livelihood and a surplus that class distinctions had scant opportunity for growth.

It is small wonder therefore that absolute and un-

related beauty lost its attraction for these dwellers in a new land surrounded by wild and tumultuous beauty directly related to daily life. The fundamental principles of literature, art, and music, although universal, to be true and real must bear the stamp of the creator's own personal and intimate experience in life. Old world literature and art was less real, even if less crude, to those sculptors of a new nation than their own life experiences. Cooper and Irving sounded a truer note than could be found in the products of a foreign school. "If out of the conditions of life in America," says Rockwell Kent,<sup>51</sup> "out of the traditions of our national existence, out of the alloyed metal of the American character there has been or shall appear an art ungraced and unencumbered by the formulæ of authority, an art deriving its intention and its form, its being, from this native soil and life, we may recognize it as transcending in significance to us all art, however beautiful, that is less our own. However absolute may be these principles upon which art, like the universe, is built, its poignancy is derived from its creator's own most personal and intimate experience of life. And by its kinship to us we'll be moved by it and love it."

True art, whether it be reflected in the printed page, or in marble, or on canvas, must be born of living experience and must reflect the beauty of it. It must reflect deep-lying, persistent, ever actively sought human values; it is one of man's ways of interpreting and reshaping the world about him. This heterogeneous population, forging on a virgin continent one

race out of many, found no continuity of civilization and cultural values; it had to create its own. And in creating its own traditions and cultural standards this new civilization placed first things first; raising human values above things. As Schlesinger so aptly points out, constant stress has been placed on the great dynamic currents which have shaped the nation's life. The first of these currents is the growth of nationality; Second, the struggle for greater democracy; Third, changes in the methods of production and distribution (as evidenced by the introduction of machinery and the many social adjustments necessitated thereby); Fourth, the constant striving for social amelioration, such as the contest for free schools, improvement in the lot of women and children, and the successive movements for humanitarian reform.

It was fortunate for America that this period of revolt against influences foreign and unsympathetic met with at least a degree of success. The American then was the prophet of individualism; the American now is its priest. It is this spirit which has changed the trend of art and literature in America. "It is in the revolt of the individual against the tyranny of every dogma, that wild revolt which for a generation has been gathering strength, that has cultivated irreverence and made a boast of it, that has offended tastes and shattered standards, that has burst the confines of tradition and has poured down every avenue and back alley of expression, it is by that revolt and from that freedom to perform in art what one desires

to or can that we may have at last an art as free and beautiful as all the joys and sorrows of our land shall need for their fulfillment. Art missed the early beauties and tragedies, the sordidness and hope, the agony, or what it was of settling, struggling here to live; it missed three centuries of war and peace, of fervent life, of faith, of tolerance; it missed the virgin forests of New England, the flooded bottom lands of the great valleys, the Five Nations, slavery, the pageant of Saratoga.

"Three centuries have passed; out of our fair and frail experience in freedom, has grown a nation richer and more powerful than a hundred Romes, and while ideals have undergone a transmutation into law and laws have to serve their master, art . . . is free. It is free in an iron age to proclaim the might, magnificence and power of commerce, industry, wealth, war, of wild extravagance, of repression, of drunkenness, of fervent faithfulness; and it is free to hate all this; to find no beauty anywhere but in the intimate and most secret realities of the human spirit; and in the ways of life that may evoke them." <sup>52</sup>

Such profound social, political, economic, and racial changes as are reflected in our kaleidoscopic national life in the past three generations could not in any country or circumstance escape creating a new set of conditions and new values out of which would emerge new cultural patterns.

Following close upon the Civil War period such artists as Whistler, Eakins, Homer, Ryder, and LaFarge, to name only a few, produced their best

work; work in point of quality which compares favorably with work done by contemporary European painters. In sculpture Saint-Gaudens, French, Taft, Barnard, Ball, MacMonies, and many others contributed much toward the building up of a greater cultural consciousness in this country. In the creation of distinct architecture and design America has much to offer.

It would serve no good purpose here to list the more than twelve thousand persons in America who are actively engaged and classified as creative artists. Nor is it necessary to dwell upon what we have achieved to date. The important point is not what we have actually gained but what we stand to gain over a considerable period of time. It will suffice here to direct attention to the unprecedented interest not only in creative work but in the numerous collections of works of the masters of all ages and in establishing art galleries—"nurseries of the æsthetic"—so that cultural influences may be available to millions of Americans who otherwise would never come in contact with the treasures of an older art. Enterprising dealers throughout Europe have for years ransacked their countries for masterpieces old and new to supply the American demand. In fact some of the nations, being disturbed at the loss of much of their art treasure, are agitating for laws to prevent further inroads being made by American wealth. Italy had already passed such a law.

As an indication of the tremendous progress made toward making America art-conscious, an interview



with one of the most prominent of French painters, Henri Matisse, is quoted.

"Isn't the atmosphere of France, the spirit of the people, more hospitable to art than in America?" asked his interviewer, Lewis Sherman.

"He looked as though he wanted to say: 'My good fool!'"

"Ttt! Ttt! Ttt! How does such an idea gain currency?" he muttered. "No, no, no! There's much more prospect for artists in America than in France. There's no sympathy for artists in France. Nowhere is so much encouragement, help, and sympathy given to artists as in America."

"Look! I could be as chauvinist as anybody. I could tell you—" and for the first time he waved his hands and became ironically rhetorical—"Ah! France! That is the country for the artists, that is where art is cherished!

"Unfortunately for the phrase, it is not so. An American artist should learn his *métier*, develop his ability and work in America. Consider how much fresher are the subjects for a painter in this country—the scenery, the architecture, the people! Let him go to Paris for an occasional visit of not more than a few months if he wants to. But an American artist should express America.

"One who has not so much temperament, I admit, may derive benefit from study in Paris. But even so he won't be on his own ground, he will be walking in other men's shoes."

To the well-balanced man, of course, these remarks

from Matisse will not be news. But I believe it is the first time such a contradiction of one of the great American myths has emanated from such an authority.

In music the accomplishments parallel those in art. There is a notable increase in the number of native composers, conductors, and operas, and while foreign musicians and composers are still welcomed by American audiences there is a tremendous swing toward the development of our own artists. Foreign students now come here to study music under American teachers—an unheard of thing a generation ago.

## II

In the realm of literature the same retarding influences of Puritanism, the same general indifference to things spiritual formed an effective insulation against any tendency toward intellectual cross-fertilization. The frontier communities became isolated patches of humanity far removed from the "heathen" influences of schools, books, libraries, art galleries—insured against social life. An occasional volume of some reverend divine's sermons was the usual extent of an ordinary home's literary possession. Learning was still a luxury to be afforded by the idle and the worldly.

But the second quarter of the nineteenth century was an unshackling period for the common man; a period of social amelioration, expansion, growth, and destruction of social barriers. This period saw the

dawn of realization of an age-long dream—universal manhood suffrage. Property qualification for voting and holding office was abolished. Men no longer could be imprisoned for debt. Public free schools spread enormously. "Out of these new influences and conditions," says Schlesinger, "there arose a new America, for the full sweep of the new tendencies was to be felt in every avenue of human endeavor and achievement, political, social, and intellectual. They led to the creation of new economic and political interests and achievements. They gave a great impetus to the establishment of a tax-supported public school system. They set in motion the first organized movement for women's rights. They produced a notable crop of humanitarian legislation, and inspired projects for the betterment of society. To the same source is also to be ascribed the growth of a truly American literature."<sup>53</sup>

This "truly American literature" begins with Washington Irving and James Fenimore Cooper who found in the wild turbulence, the strangely calm retreats, the incomparable beauty, the hardy pioneer battling rugged nature and savage natives, the raw materials of great epics. Their work, as good as it was, was only a beginning, and a small beginning, but one must remember that the United States is a very young nation. Its short life of less than a hundred and fifty years makes it a mere infant compared with many European nations. The older nations with a homogeneous people and with roots sunk deep in the past have developed certain clearly defined national

traits and have created a distinctly racial and national "atmosphere" which lends individuality and color to their literature. There is a sort of personality which hovers about such a national spirit. But that spirit must develop after ages and ages of settled habitation in which the fact of time acts as a reagent to form the precipitate which we call culture and nationalism. Being a transplanted people, an assembled civilization, a composite nation, compact of every nationality, ideal, and creed, we have been touched profoundly in our short national life by a thousand changes, geographical, industrial, social.

If the first third of the nineteenth century produced only two names of outstanding interest in the literary world, the second part of the century, roughly from 1830 to 1875, witnessed the emergence into popular favor of works in point of sheer quality that meet on favorable terms with contemporary literary products in any nation. Emerson, Poe, Whitman, Hawthorne, Holmes, as well as many lesser writers—Bryant, Thoreau, Whittier, Lowell, Longfellow, and Alcott—made important contributions to the literature of America. While the works of the second third of the century, with few exceptions, reflected a detached beauty and a noticeable chastity of thought and expression there was evidenced even then a tendency to reflect the life, idealism, and social outlook of locality. Localities differ so widely in expression, pronunciation, and idiom, manners and interests, that the members of the First Continental Congress had considerable difficulty in understanding one another,

yet the literature of the period reflects none of this. A few decades later Lowell, in his Bigelow papers, introduces us to the peculiarities of the Yankee dialect of New England. Whittier creates the atmosphere of the New England farm home but he made little attempt to delineate character. His approach to understanding was distinctly spiritual.

The last quarter of the century emphasized the drift from the traditionalism of chaste expression and spiritual content to a more intimate portrayal of subject matter. James Whitcomb Riley in his Hoosier world portraits is a worthy exponent of this newer trend. He was primarily a delineator of rural types and scenes. He never wrote from a detached point of view; rather with a warmth of personal knowledge. Whittier and Cooper wrote with sympathy but from a point of view outside that which they depict. So did Lowell in building the characters of his Bigelow papers, but in no sense are his characters as real and convincing as those of Riley. He put Indiana as a place and as a people more thoroughly and more completely in the consciousness of America than has been done by any other poet before or since his day for any other locality or people. His mastery of his craft is unquestioned.

He did not create a strange new world; he only made articulate the world about him, a vivid world of winding roads and lazy streams, of barefoot boys and strong crude men, of drunkards and lovable children, of farmers and tramps and hired-hands and grandmothers and lovers. He, being always essentially a

child in his outlook upon life, was particularly apt in seeing grown-ups and the grown-ups' world with a child's untroubled vision, and in sketching them with unswerving fidelity.

Since the tendency in America is to label everything and every local and national trait, it will not be out of place here to label the broader and more comprehensive steps in the growth of our literature. Colonial American literature was characterized largely by its strong note of morality and patriotism. That of the New England school was spiritual, while the next step, typified by Riley and Mark Twain, was emotional and broadly humorous. The next distinct step is found in that group of searchers after "hidden causes" which might be termed psychological. Edgar Lee Masters in his *Spoon River Anthology* captains this group. Freudianism possibly is a better word to use in connection with the efforts of that large body of writers whose works are tinged with some elements of pseudo-scientific realism. The logical consequence of this psycho-analytic, dream-world behaviorism in literature was the depiction of sex life and triangle problems with a stark realism which to some readers is more repulsive than revealing. Mary Austin very well expresses the slight nausea which this manifestation of a faintly sordid touch in recent literature gives to many readers. "I should like to explain why, even when admitting its objectionableness, I find the cold lewdness and sputtering vulgarity of novels and plays the past year or two a considerable advance over the saprophytic im-

pudicity of the Freudian era of American fiction. Lewd and vulgar as even such outstanding writers as Eugene O'Neill and Sinclair Lewis are occasionally, it is still a vulgarity as natural as sweat, and a lewdness as unabashed as the things little boys chalk up on barn doors. It has no kinship with the slinking salacity which, slightly disguised as romantic fiction, shouts to our youth from every news stand: 'Come and take me!' Incredible as it seems, it was still possible in the prudish nineties for a man who specialized in sentimental lechery to be elected a member of the American Academy, which could scarcely happen in our day. So far as our reputedly frank fiction goes, one nail drives out another at last." <sup>54</sup>

While fiction was moving from one expression-pattern to another more serious writing was assuming a definite thought-mood, distinctive in characteristics, as the natural and logical outgrowth of democratic tendencies among free peoples. Until comparatively recent times the common man was not supposed to have definite opinions of his own, therefore he had no need of thought-provoking reading matter. He received his opinions ready digested, from the almanac, the parson, and the volunteer orator. His patriotism was cared for by the Fourth-of-July speaker and the Daughters of the American Revolution. Occasionally the newspaper editorial came to his assistance. "Fine writing" was for the literati; factual material and philosophical treatise for the highbrow; light, low, and lean fiction for the rabble.

Since democratic principles hold that one man's vote is just as good as another's, it must follow that one man's opinion is as valuable as another's. Of course no one seriously contends that the opinion of one person is as weighty as that of another, yet the common man is taking seriously his duty of learning things for himself and he is going to sources of authority in increasing numbers as never before. The reading public is becoming more inclusive, better informed, and has assumed a more critical attitude toward the world of thought and speculation and beauty. This attitude has increased the tendency to accept only tested thought, for an accumulated body of trustworthy and tested thought is the only basis of sound opinion. Like planting only tested seed there is promise of better results.

As an indication of this newer attitude of the reading public, the average man in 1930 read two and three-fourths books of a serious nature—history, philosophy, religion, science, biography, sociology, philology—for each time he read one volume of fiction, poetry, or drama. Reference has been made elsewhere to the total of approximately 155,000,000 volumes in circulation from nearly 7000 free public libraries in the United States. The average yearly turnover of each book, reference works and highly technical books excepted, was eleven. This of course does not include the many thousands of privately owned books in small home libraries. It is this more thoughtful and more discriminating attitude of the reading public which has created the demand for the



ever-widening stream of more serious reading matter. Thus a legitimate medium has been opened for the expression of tested opinion in readable form, yet within the bounds of authentic scholarship. Hence American fiction has happily escaped the cumbersome incubus of the treatise-novel and problem-play. Our creative writers are free to enlarge the field of material suitable for fictional form without feeling it necessary to write a novel in order to preach a sermon. It must be counted a valuable gain that the day of the salacious sex garbage, birth control propaganda, the pro and con of religion and prohibition, psycho-analysis or Freudian sophistry, excessive moralization, and the like, as proper wadding for the novel-pattern of expression, is past. All this matter will be given its proper audience without debasing the art form of the novel.

One of the happiest auguries of a truer and more universally appreciated art of tomorrow is that our medium of expression is now free from the "trammels of classicism." Not only has the revolt against the classical tradition won its fight and lost its meaning but the revolt against revolt is ended. The intolerance of intolerance is slinking into dark corners. Just as the awkward and poorly prepared high school boy resorts to swagger and an occasional impudence to conceal his own short comings, thereby confessing his sense of inferiority, so has America in times past attempted to make up for its feeling of inferiority by yapping, braggadocio, and misdirected criticisms. Happily we are now able to stand without embarrass-

ment before all those who criticise, confident of our own merit and possibilities. America has spent her due season of swaggering youth and has entered a more mature and promising age of art-consciousness and intellectual growth. Critics like H. L. Mencken, Theodore Dreiser, and Sinclair Lewis strain themselves inordinately in tremendous efforts to tell Americans how they are losing their independence and virility, and that decay is eating away the foundations. The average man, too well informed to get excited, smiles indulgently, yawns a little, and replies with a good-natured "Oh, yeah?"

Evidence is accumulating that there is an increasing appreciation of our own American literature based on a growing worthiness of appreciation. American writers are more and more developing a technic and an attitude, as well as a fidelity to American life, which is reassuring. Referring to the work of only a few American writers Elizabeth Drew recently concluded that "These are masterpieces (Ethan Frome, A Lost Lady, etc.,) whose scene happens to be laid in America and whose creators are American. . . . In view of the artistic output in the field of fiction alone, it is difficult for a foreigner to grasp why the radical critics continue to insist that man cannot be an artist in America—that its civilization crushes an artist out of existence. . . . The view that it is not only difficult but impossible in America is surely disproved by the world of modern American letters. . . . There are new American artists who have definitely accepted the truth that for

them writing must be American writing, its vitality must be American vitality, its inspiration American life as they know it. They know that this new literature cannot aim at an imitation of European ideals, because it is not European, but that, whether the passion which is behind its creation is a passion of revolt from certain aspects of American civilization, or the passion of interest in and enjoyment of the common human lives of the American people, it must clothe itself in some form which carries with it the rhythms and colorings of a new imagination." <sup>55</sup>

### III

What seems to be a matter of greatest promise for the future of American art and literature is that there is emerging an essential unity with an utter lack of standardization of form and pattern. Architecture may express itself vertically or horizontally, yet maintain grace and harmony; it may ignore altogether chaste Grecian forms, the solid Roman, the Gothic, the English pattern—and frequently does—and still be truly artistic. It is free to use one or all of these, or ignore them in part and still be truly distinctive, modern, and American. The landscape artist has expanded his sphere to include whole cities, and a new era of city planning and beautification, parks and playgrounds, museums and galleries, is arriving. The dramatist no longer uses the "grand manner" of Shakespeare; nor does he despise it. He is free to employ one act or a dozen for the portrayal of life

patterns. His play may be in poetic form or in slang; he may require six hours or but two; if only his work is credibly good and true he will get a hearing and encouragement. The poet of today may employ the high lyrical form of the Elizabethan period, or the formless form of a Sandburg or a Lindsay; he may use the emotional approach of a Guest or a Riley, but his clarity and beauty and fidelity to situation and scene and life, whatever the form, will be admired and understood.

Since the average man of the American reading public is touched by countless new thoughts and influences he is increasingly capable of keeping his poise without being condemned to one groove in his intellectual life. There is a growing social unity as well as intellectual unity in our common life, a unity of diversity, which makes it possible for the reader to be equally stimulated by such widely different works as those of John Dewey and Upton Sinclair, or Ernest Hemingway and Zane Gray. He can read Elmer Gantry without exploding or Pollyanna without looking foolish. All in all an unmistakable characteristic of our present literary status is that the writer, whatever form his work assumes, is attempting to place his picture or figure in essential harmony with the conditions from which it was drawn. It is this diversity of conditions and experience in a country so new and large, and a life so virile and vibrating, so well-informed and sophisticated which makes a standardized expression-pattern impossible. The aim of the artist is to place his work on a common

background in proper relationship to his own interpretation of our common American experience and thus to achieve a composite work of art which shall have virility, harmony, beauty, and truth.

•

**PART SEVEN**

**SOCIAL INTEGRATION**

•

*President Eliot holds that we have made five important contributions to the advancement of civilization. First of all we have done more than any other people to further peace-keeping, and to substitute legal arbitration for the brute conflict of war. Second, we have set a splendid example of the broadest religious toleration,—even though Holland had first shown us how. Third, we have made manifest the wisdom of universal manhood suffrage. Fourth, by our welcoming of new-comers from all parts of the earth, we have proved that men belonging to a great variety of races are fit for political freedom. Finally, we have succeeded in diffusing material well-being among the whole population to an extent without parallel in any other country in the world.*

*Brander Matthews.*

## PART SEVEN

### SOCIAL INTEGRATION

#### I

IN as true a sense as Valery sees the fate of all civilization balancing perilously between the two dangers of order and disorder one may conclude that the fate of modern democratic civilization is determined by its ultimate degree of social integration, or the lack of it. Since we cannot conceive of society as something apart from individuals or groups we must view the two as mutually complementary. Our chief concern has been directed toward finding out in what degree the individual or group reflects the whole of society and in what manner the civilization of the whole of society influences and moulds the individual.

If American civilization has created more burdens for the individual than it has lifted; if its attempts to discipline the great streams of social energy about us have resulted only in damming up some of the streams causing them later to break with greater fury and destruction; if materialism has indeed corroded the spiritual life of the individual in society and has created an eclipse of the very foundation of that spiritual life; if our modern machine age has mech-



anized the mind and soul of this culture and made inevitable a cold regimentation of all our intellectual processes, then truly has American civilization failed. But what some have taken for regimentation is only a process of integration of forces to prevent stagnation; what some have called burdens are only huge counter weights in the process of lightening burdens; what some see as spiritual corrosion is merely spiritual reintegration around a new set of values, a new center of gravity.

Social integration is a process of focus and refinement; it is the convergence and co-ordination of those mighty forces, intellectual, spiritual, social, and artistic which have ever been the ultimate foundations of civilization and culture. It means even more; it proclaims the very necessity of cultivating, directing, and enriching these forces to the end that stagnation shall never become a recognized condition in any part of the social organism. Americans who understand America can well afford to be indulgent with those many critics, native and foreign, who have been unduly influenced by an alien point of view for they judge America by an externally fixed standard, determined by comparison with older civilizations. They fail to grasp the significance of any movement or growth not determined by older patterns. And centuries-old traditions which have conditioned their point of view have accustomed them to accept as inevitable large stagnant masses of stolid humans who have ever been denied the amenities of enlightenment, grace, and cultured forces. Now that we have

refused to allow any such pools of stagnation to exist; have bid them bestir themselves; have touched them with a quickening spirit, causing that great stream to flow upward to higher levels, those of an older order are amazed, are prophesying total eclipse, and have shifted their gaze from the shining peaks to that rising level. But the shining peaks are still there. And as has been abundantly shown in preceding pages some of the harshness of this criticism is due to a number of things, among them jealousy of age being outstripped by youth; of age-old privileges being scattered to the masses instead of being retained for the few; of greater spiritual and social values being extended to those who in the past have never been thought worthy of possessing either.

The French newspaper, *Figaro*, recently conducted a symposium "For or Against American Civilization," which was more revealing of France to America than otherwise. One might ask in all seriousness: Why be either "for" or "against" American civilization? Why not understand it for what it is and evaluate it for what of promise it contains rather than condemn it. Most of the comments on our civilization were of the shotgun variety of criticism which succeeded only in revealing the critics. Henri Massis, editor of the *Revue Universelle*, was very penetrating and searching in his statement that "you have not satisfied all the needs of human conscience by assuring for everyone a Ford and a bathroom." Jean Cassou, French novelist said: "In my view a civilized people is one which drinks wine." And Emile Bauman,

author and writer, was at least quite frank in his smugness and self-satisfaction in his statement that "I do not know America and am scarcely tempted to know it. The thought of a house twenty stories high horrifies me." And Louis Bertrand, of the French Academy, holds Americanism in horror because he is "a Latin and an individualist." Homberg thinks it is impossible for Latins to apply the name of "civilization" to the "collective American mentality."

Those who think of the machine as the nemesis of American civilization assume a similarly unintelligent attitude, for they persistently refuse to turn the picture over to learn if it contains another view. The Smith plant in Milwaukee has been frequently pointed out as an example of how men are thrown out of work because of the installation of modern equipment. In 1920 the Smith plant, manufacturer of automobile frames, employed some 2000 men. But after the installation of newer labor-saving machinery the same plant was able to turn out 10,000 steel automobile frames daily, requiring only 200 men instead of 2000. What became of the 1800 eliminated? Breadline? Not at all! Because of the increased demand all the old employees were retained to run the old plant at no wage reduction on "small orders" and new ones employed to man the new machinery. Instead of displacing men it created new jobs. Besides, the same plant, by means of a new electric arc welding process applied to couplings for joints in oil well pipes has supplied jobs, directly and indirectly, for more than 5000 men. The automo-

bile age has thrown the old blacksmith out of a job but in 1930 the automobile industry employed 4,700,459 persons. Largely because of labor-saving devices wages have more than doubled since 1914. Official figures have shown that men thrown out of work by labor-saving devices in one industry are absorbed by another.

Government figures covering the years from 1920 to 1927 list 2,000,000 fewer men in agriculture, mining, manufacturing, and government service in 1927 than there were in 1920, but there was an increase in the same period in transportation, distribution, professional and personal service, of 2,817,000.

The motion picture industry temporarily threw out of work a few thousand so-called legitimate actors but in 1930 its payroll numbered approximately 400,000 workers.

It has been proved many times over that labor-saving devices not only has not increased the number of unemployed but has greatly increased the number of jobs and raised the wage scale. To some this may not prove anything either for or against civilization, but it very clearly proves that we as a people are able to adjust ourselves to our rapidly changing environment; that each major change means an increase in material comforts, more leisure, better living conditions, with the resultant increase in the wise employments of this increased leisure. Most important of all is its absolute veto of any suggestion that we are standardized, regimented, or stratified.

Returning to *Figaro's* recent symposium one finds

the frequent assertion that not only is "there no such thing as American civilization," but that such a thing as a distinctive American civilization is impossible "when you consider that the United States is inhabited by a people whose forebears were a mixture of the riffraff of Europe and Puritan fanatics." It has always been a puzzle to many why the absence of a fine old family tree in America has seemed to trouble Europe more than it does us. That we are a people without traditions may be not so much of a liability as an asset. China has an unbroken tradition for several thousand years, yet it is seriously questioned whether that fact in itself isn't a detriment to China, for as a nation she lives almost entirely by tradition and formula. "The Chinese," says Dittmer, "are incapable of comprehending the possibility of voluntary spinsterhood. They consider it unnatural and perhaps immoral. Our single female missionaries in that country have often met with serious embarrassment in explaining their status. The local gentry have often come to the conclusion that the excess females were the concubines of the males of the mission station; a situation which, according to their lights, was entirely proper, or at least a logical explanation of the enigma. To them marriage and reproduction is woman's only career—indeed, her only reason for existence. They are at a loss to know what to call a mature virgin. Their terms apply to adolescent girls, and to apply the same term to those of mature years seems ridiculous. They are puzzled by the small families in their midst.

They know by observation that it is not due to high infant mortality rate for the foreigner does not lose his children as they do theirs. What is the reason? 'Well, perhaps they are degenerate,' for 'no man with an iota of filial piety would voluntarily keep the size of his family down.' The ideal of the Oriental is to marry early and as frequently as necessary, to insure the largest possible posterity. To be sure, this program has defeated its purpose, for the resulting overpopulation has produced such a death-rate that their excess of births over deaths is really smaller than ours. Nevertheless, the style more effectively regulates marriage and reproduction than do any such practical considerations as might be advanced."<sup>58</sup>

Some profess to see a trait of snobbishness in our immigration restriction laws, but they fail to understand our desire to raise standards and maintain them as a step toward a higher culture and civilization. The United States has a smaller population per square mile than most of the other civilized nations, which has led some of our boastful and unthinking newspapers to declare that the state of Texas alone, if intensively cultivated, "could feed every person on the planet," which leads Dittmer to say: "After long residence in China, the writer is inclined to believe that if we adopted China's standard of living, Texas, plus the rest of the United States, could very nearly do it, but at what an 'animal level' of existence! At what cost to civilization!"

While the population of the United States averages approximately forty-one persons per square mile, the

populations of some of the Oriental and European countries average from one hundred to well above six hundred persons per square mile. In Europe there is little expansion area possible. In Asia more intensive cultivation, if that be possible or feasible, and the utmost utilization of her sparsely populated areas will be hardly sufficient to raise the standard of living of her already teeming millions to a human level. The interior of Australia is largely arid. The major portion of South America is tropical. For Africa one can hardly hazard a guess as to its future expansion or living standard. It may be safely concluded that the world's possible increase of agricultural area is strictly limited. What does this mean in the face of a world population which will double in one century? Many Americans are thoroughly committed to our policy of immigration limitation in order that we may maintain our high standards and further solidify our community of interests.

The question of immigration and its effect on the prospects of a distinctive American culture has often been the source of heated discussion. "The cultural effect of immigration, due to the variety of peoples who have come to these shores, has been exaggerated," according to one noted American of foreign birth.<sup>67</sup> "The language of the country has remained English, and the changes which have come into its vocabulary are not traceable in any great degree to the presence of a mass of non-English speaking peoples. The imported speech suffers from the disintegrating effect of English phrases, but the English

remains unaffected by Scandinavians in Minneapolis, Germans in Milwaukee, or Yiddish in New York.

"Congress is at least ninety-nine per cent pure American; its loss of prestige is due to its own limitations, and has nothing to do with the foreign-born citizens who helped to elect its members.

"The influence of the Irish in national politics has waned, and now that Ireland has been freed from the oppression of the English, Ireland has to be saved only from the oppression of the Irish. It is very interesting to note that we were most influenced in our international relationships by the French, who furnished us with practically no immigration. The national sentiment has been little effected by our English cultural and political heritage, or by the millions of German-born American citizens and other so-called hyphenates. Their desires were as effective in determining our foreign policies as they are in shaping our national legislation. The World War, the Eighteenth Amendment, and the quota immigration laws prove this conclusively." In other words, the conflicting nationalities have served quite largely to neutralize each other causing our national and foreign policies which have grown out of our experiences to be accepted and approved by the adopted citizens.

## II

What, then, may one safely conclude as to the present status of American culture and civilization? What of its future? Is there in reality a firm basis



on which a broad distinctive American culture may flourish?

In answering all questions of like nature the American now feels a degree of confidence which until recently was not present. Too frequently in the recent past, Americans, when speaking of their own country—especially to foreigners—assumed an apologetic manner as if they were not quite certain whether they should cower and admit everything, not being in a position to feel proud of anything American, or invent an ingenious alibi for our deficiencies. That was a correct attitude to assume. Our culture was nothing to speak of anyway. Our civilization had to be discussed with due humility and with deference to the admitted superiority of European culture and civilization. Happily all that is rapidly changing to an attitude of confidence and pride. Not in any spirit of boastfulness but upon a knowledge of sound achievement and ordered direction we Americans face alike the criticisms, friendly or hostile, native or foreign, without any need or desire to quail or apologize. We now realize that the standard of our complex civilization is much in advance of that of the old world and that our culture has broken through the frontiers of older cultures, ever pushing into new fields hitherto never reached—fields infinitely rich in varied cultural possibilities.

First, America is attempting to answer with a greater degree of affirmation than has ever been undertaken by any other nation, the question, "Am I My Brother's Keeper?" In framing an answer to

this question America has found many brothers among many races and in divers conditions: in remote mountainous regions, illiterate, uncouth, and untouched by the great stream of life; in the teeming ghetto; in squalid tenements; in unsightly slum districts; in halls of learning, and in all the stations in between. America's program of social amelioration, firmly rooted in the consciousness and deliberate choice and will of a whole people, has for its chief concern the quickening of the noblest impulses of the individual, and the welfare of childhood and youth. It must apply with equal fairness and solicitude to all grades and classes.

This program includes universal education, and society, acting through public opinion crystallized into law, takes the child, within certain age limits, from its home for several hours each day and places him in school; it denies him the entrance to factories and workshops during his tender years in order that he may be the better prepared to meet the economic stress of later years. It insists on watching and safeguarding his health through a program of health education which is almost as universally applied as compulsory schooling. It is ever solicitous that the submerged elements shall rise from their neglected conditions trained to substitute independence for a stolid dependence on a "poverty-minded attitude" that the world owes them a living.

In our insistence upon giving every child an equal chance we have been tardy in realizing that local unit of control in school administration hasn't always

worked toward equalization of opportunity. With the township as a unit, there are townships in some states, all using a like schedule of taxing power, in which \$10 per pupil annually is the maximum amount which can be raised for the education of the child. In the same state there are townships with the economic ability to supply more than \$400 annually per child. Using entire states as units it is interesting to note that the economic resources back of each child between the ages of 6 to 13 years varies in each state, from \$11,576 in Nevada (1926) to only \$1,895 in the state of Mississippi. The amount expended per child of the above ages varies in like proportion. California leads with an annual expenditure for each child's education of \$127.26, while Georgia spends an average of \$14.08. Obviously a child living in a community which is able to furnish him with only \$14.08 in educational opportunity year after year, when placed alongside him who has enjoyed opportunities nine times greater, is starting life under a fearful handicap. The tendency in American education at present is to enlarge the unit of control, approaching a time when money for education shall be collected where wealth is greatest and spent where the need is greatest. That policy can be supported as the very essence of democracy. Instead of being a policy of standardization it is a policy of equalization.

Second, we are the most vital and unified political institution in the world. We have seen a greater amount of social welfare legislation enacted since the emergence of an insurgent group in Congress in 1913

than in any like period in our history. Likewise greater substantial results have been realized in punishing crooks and grafters in high places. Let anyone who doubts compare Teapot Dome with Credit Mobilier, or the Vare's, the Frank L. Smith's, the Bill Thompson's with Quay, Penrose, Platt, or the Tweed regime.

And in every department and phase of government there is less of mobocracy, boss rule, and mediocrity, and a more definite tendency to follow the advice and leadership of experts; to approach the solution of many of our social problems by a process of scientific analysis. The average voter is better informed and more discerning than ever before. He is no longer an unconscious victim of mob action and bossism. His independence is reflected in Congress and legislative halls the country over. The demagogue is passing, giving place to a more critical and exacting public opinion.

Third, America, from its inception as a nation, has fostered an unfettered and broadly tolerant religion. Worship has become an individual affair instead of mass action externally enforced. Such a policy has not only demonstrated its wisdom but has revealed that the large mass of people are deeply religious and are creating a saner and more effective thought-pattern as pertains matters spiritual. The spirit of religious toleration is everywhere predominant and its essence is compelling a broad toleration in every phase of American life. Since external compulsion has been removed and the state no longer

directs the church, the spiritual valuations which the state could not enforce, have begun voluntarily to permeate the state and more thoroughly each year to direct the course of statecraft.

Fourth, our broad program of secondary and higher education has quickened the finest instincts and impulses of the masses. Quite naturally it has drawn sharp criticism from those who never before saw such a program put into operation and therefore thought it an absurdity of high degree to try such a thing. Many educators are the most severe critics of our educational status, not because they disfavor the system but because of the failure of the system to live up to exaggerated expectations of it. True, many youths receive high school diplomas or college degrees who do not deserve them and who cannot be benefited by them. But that was true of apprentices in the days of feudalism; it is true today under the Soviet program in Russia. Thousands, however, who are worthy but who never could have climbed out of their submerged condition except by virtue of our program of social amelioration, have become experts and leaders in their chosen fields. Our program of public education today, "from kindergarten to university," is conceded the most thorough and inclusive of any of the family of nations. Standardized? Yes! But standardized programs and methods of procedure have been the means of advance. Materialistic? No! Mechanized? No! Those who profess to see mechanization of the spirit and intellect due to standardized procedure, or to the reality of a technological

economy, are merely inefficient psychologists. One cannot mechanize a brilliant mind or an alert spirit by changing his tools any more than one can stimulate a dullard by taking away his tractor and giving him a team of oxen.

Fifth, the bent of the American mind is toward peace. Of course we have always professed to be a peace-loving people, even while engaged in making war. Well, we all forget to take ourselves seriously at times. Since the World War, however, we have developed a will to peace and have begun in earnest the fight against war. A few notable incidents prove this conclusively. The big navy advocates have been definitely halted; an ever-widening group of independent thinkers of all classes are able to see oil and American dollars behind pious declarations of good intentions toward Nicaragua; propaganda wears a too familiar mask when attempts are made to embroil us in a war with Mexico—even to pointed allusions to American absentee landlordism of large Mexican estates. The Kellogg-Briand Outlawry of War pact may be, as some see it, only a beautiful gesture, but it is a distinct psychological gain toward creating a will to peace. One of the most apparently encouraging gains is the existence of an active and thoughtful minority who realize that the greatest guarantee of peace is that first war be outlawed in the hearts of men. That cannot be done by appeals to the emotions and passions but by the application of reason. And that is the method by which America is beginning to evaluate war and peace.

Sixth, though America is not a unit biologically, she is rapidly becoming one culturally and spiritually. We are compact of many races. That is to our advantage, for our varied background of racial traits and culture-patterns is our best guarantee against stratification. A healthy unity is being developed by our struggle against a deadening uniformity and the alien has many times helped us to realize a unified diversity which otherwise would have given us the color of dull drab. That America has passed laws restricting the further increase of population by a flood of immigration does not imply racial intolerance; rather, it is the application of racial birth-control, in a manner of speaking, in order to keep our growing family within the limits of our ability to properly care for it. The American standard of life must not be lowered or cheapened for it is the best assurance we have of a foundation on which to construct our continuing civilization.

Seventh, in the consideration of culture those of an alien viewpoint establish an index based on one trait, at most two, by which to pass judgment on the state of our culture. One versed in the classics, or one who can recite by rote the merits of a painting is cultured. Nothing else matters. His mind is filled with the merits of a beauty detached from life. But the achievement of a culture that will measure up to America's requirements of a cultured person, which are much more exacting than those of any older culture, is not a simple matter. Admittedly the standards by which we judge a cultured and civilized in-

dividual are as much in advance of the European standard as our standard of living is in advance of theirs. By no sort of juggling of standards is it possible for us to point to one individual trait, as for instance, the glib statement that "any nation which drinks wine is civilized" and label it cultured. Indeed, it is difficult for us to understand what the drinking of wine, or the abstention from it, has to do with civilization. We speak of American civilization and culture as being broad, meaning that it is inclusive. It is inclusive enough to apply not merely to the gentry, the noble, the cloistered scholar, but to the great masses who have ever been surging upward toward the eternity of freedom but seldom reaching it. The status and advance of the individual is inextricably interwoven with that of the group, and the integration of the two must be complete so that the advance of one may not be at the expense of the other.

Much has been written on how "the humblest European sees in art an aristocratic symbol of his own personality," or how "the lowliest Italian worker goes about whistling arias of all the best known operas; he knows them all." Recently the director of a large art institute in the heart of America's great steel mill area was interviewed on the matter of art appreciation and understanding of the average foreigner as compared with the native American. It is noteworthy that a previous racial survey was made of the city in which this art institute is located. Each racial group was recorded only if it numbered a minimum of five hundred of its nationals located and



working in the area. The survey recorded thirty-seven such racial groups within the district served by this art center. In one year the number visiting the institute was slightly in excess of seventy-five thousand. Said the director:

"They come in about equal numbers, the foreigner and the American, I mean, and all seem to enjoy it in about equal degree. . . . But I have noticed this difference: the foreigner, who is the average mill worker, knows the name of the painting and the name of the artist, especially if it is an old and well-known painting. If it is the work of a contemporary artist he sets about learning the names; that's all he seems to want to know. The American of like station in life wants first of all to know what the picture represents; he is interested in scene, detail, incident—not so much in technic. He is anxious to know to what extent the picture depicts life in its relation to his own personal experience. . . ." In short, the European saw the painting only as a symbol. He had learned his formula, his song by rote; the American saw it and loved it in proportion as it became intimate with his own experience of joys and sorrows and longings. He saw it not as a symbol of detached and unrelated beauty but as an intimate depiction of his own experiences and as a permanent glorification of the commonplace. Unwittingly the interview revealed one of the most fundamental differences between American and European cultures.

It is needless to discuss further the manner and degree in which America is rapidly becoming the

mecca for students and teachers of art and music the world over. It is only just, however, to protest emphatically against assertions of some Americans that Europeans come here to work only because they are attracted by American dollars. No doubt some Europeans, like some Americans, are mean enough to place materialism above beauty, but it is safe to say that the very great numbers of them come because of the freshness of scene and exuberance of our people, and the genuine hospitality and sympathy we have for creative artists in every field.

Finally, Americans are in no wise reluctant to admit that their civilization has much of standardization in it; every civilization has. The very fact of civilization itself, Inca, Egyptian, Chinese, or Eskimo, demands a notable degree of standardization. But we are not materialistic. Our great program of social amelioration is touching every phase of American life. We are not willing to allow any group of people to die wholesale by starvation because of tradition or trust in a magical formula; we don't purposely ignore the undue suffering of motherhood and the ruthless waste of babies because of dogma or creed; we are not content to see the ravages of disease go unchecked; we are not content to allow great masses of people remain in ignorance and economically submerged because of caste or class. Ours is a mechanistic age and we are pleased that it is so, for that very fact gives a greater emphasis to the spiritual phase of life. It has speeded up the tempo of life; has changed its rhythm and has whetted our sense of direction. The very

accomplishments of our mechanistic age have pricked imaginations to unbounded activity and diversity, and by just so much has enriched modern life beyond the most extravagant dreams of a century ago.

In politics and government we have entered upon a new era since 1914. The individual voter is becoming more important, while the political boss is passing slowly over the Great Divide—and the demagogue is following close behind the hearse as one of the chief mourners. The exploiter, the grafter, the lobbyist, and the propagandist is lingering behind but he is having an increasingly difficult time. Although the science of government has made progress very slowly, its direction is well-known and definitely marked. The scientific mind and the expert are to be found in every bureau and department of our national government—and their voices are heard. They represent the interest and wishes of the average voter much more accurately than does the common politician and payroll patriot. They are demanding that government shall no longer be forced to meet twentieth century conditions with eighteenth century machinery. The only consideration they ask for democracy and the type of individualism which it fosters is that it be given a sporting chance for normal growth.

And the individualism to which America is irrevocably committed is the individualism of the many at the expense of none. No pyramid of regal splendor, resting upon the broad base of millions of neglected workers, in order that a few privileged persons may do bright things, shall long endure upon American

soil. Political processes are being removed from dark subways into the light of full publicity. Politics are in the process of being set free from the numbing influences of boss manipulation. Government must be so ordered that it shall be free at all times to regulate the industrial and financial power of the country to the end that the man with only one talent may increase his substance in the same proportion and with the same facility that is accorded a man with five talents. He must not be forced by the despair of neglect and exploitation, economic and political slavery, to bury his talent in the tortuous cycle of poverty, ignorance, and unremitting toil, in order that a few five-talent men may increase their substance a thousand fold. The individual must not be crowded out of the race because of his stature, but in a free field he must be allowed to run his course faced by no unjust restraints, and at the end he must have his full share and substance and sustenance of life meted out to all those who run, and in a just proportion to his contribution to the victory.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- CHARACTER AND EVENTS (2 Vol.)—*John Dewey*, Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1929.
- THE DECLINE OF THE WEST—*Oswald Spengler*, Alfred Knopp, New York, 1926.
- THE REVOLT AGAINST CIVILIZATION—*Lothrop Stoddard*, Scribner's Sons, New York, 1922.
- CIVILIZATION—*Clive Bell*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1928.
- AMERICAN DEMOCRACY—*John T. Greenan and Albert B. Meredith*, Houghton, Mifflin, New York, 1924.
- THE OLD SAVAGE IN THE NEW CIVILIZATION—*Raymond B. Fosdick*, Doubleday, Doran & Co., New York, 1928.
- THE WORLD IN THE MAKING—*Count Herman Keyserling*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1927.
- THE LIVING PAST—*F. S. Marvin*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1920.
- TOWARD CIVILIZATION—*Chas. A. Beard*, Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1930.
- THE DAY AFTER TOMORROW—*Philip Gibbs*, Doubleday, Doran & Co., New York, 1928.
- A PREFACE TO POLITICS—*Walter Lippman*, Kennerly, London, 1914.
- AMERICAN ESTIMATES—*Henry Seidel Canby*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1929.
- RECENT SOCIAL CHANGES—*William F. Ogburn*, Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1927.
- THE MAKING OF A GREAT RACE—*Edward A. Steiner*, Revell Co., New York, 1929.

- WHITHER DEMOCRACY?—*M. J. Lennes*, Harper & Brother, New York, 1928.
- WHITHER MANKIND?—*Chas. A. Beard*, Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1928.
- THE EVOLUTION OF THE POLITICIAN—*Robert Douglas Bowden*, Stratford Co., Boston, 1924.
- VARIETY—*Paul Valery*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1927.
- THE ROMANCE OF THE ATOM—*Benj. Harrow*, Boni & Liveright, New York, 1927.
- SCIENCE, THE FALSE MESSIAH—*C. E. Ayers*, Bobbs Merrill & Co., Indianapolis, 1927.
- AMERICA COMES OF AGE—*Andre Siegfried*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1927.
- SKEPTICAL ESSAYS—*Bertrand Russell*, W. W. Norton & Co., New York, 1928.
- THE NEWER SPIRIT—*V. F. Calverton*, Boni & Liveright, New York, 1925.
- AMERICAN CRITICISM—*William A. Drake*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1926.
- THE NEMESIS OF DEMOCRACY—*Ralph Adams Cram*, Marshall Jones & Co., Boston, 1919.
- NATIONAL CHARACTER—*Ernest Baker*, Harper Brothers, New York, 1927.
- MEN AND MACHINES—*Stuart Chase*, Macmillan Co., New York, 1929.
- EUROPE IN ZIGZAGS—*Sisley Huddleston*, Lippincott Co., Philadelphia, 1929.
- RECENT GAINS IN AMERICAN CIVILIZATION—*Edited by Kirby Page*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1928.
- ADVENTUROUS AMERICA—*Edwin Mims*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1929.
- AMERICAN CHARACTER—*Brander Matthews*, Crowell, New York, 1906.
- THE NEW AMERICAN—*William Lawrence*, Houghton, Mifflin Co., New York, 1929.

- THE SPIRITUAL REBIRTH OF EUROPE—*Rt. Rev. Nikolai Velmirovic*, Faith Press, London, 1920.
- ROMAN SOCIETY—*Samuel Dill*, Macmillan, London, 1904.
- PRINCIPLES OF SOCIOLOGY—*Edward A. Ross*, The Century Co., New York, 1930.
- POLITICAL AND SOCIAL HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE—*Carlton J. Hayes*, Macmillan Co., New York, 1926 (Vol. I).
- OUR FAITH IN EDUCATION—*Henry Suzzallo*, Lippincott Co., Philadelphia, 1924.
- TOWARDS A NEW EDUCATION—*The New Education Fellowship* (England) Knopf & Co., 1930.
- AN EDUCATED NATION—*Basil A. Yeaxlee*, Oxford Press, London.
- UPSTREAM—*Ludwig Lewisohn*, Boni & Liveright, New York, 1922.
- EDUCATION FOR A CHANGING CIVILIZATION—*William H. Kilpatrick*, Macmillan Co., New York, 1930.
- THE AMERICAN ROAD TO CULTURE—*George S. Counts*, The John Day Co., New York, 1930.
- ART IN AMERICA—*Suzanne La Follette*, Harpers, New York, 1930.
- SOCIAL PROBLEMS—*Gillan, Dittmer, and Colbert*, Century Co., New York, 1928.
- A POLITICAL AND SOCIAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES—*Arthur M. Schlesinger*, Macmillan, N. Y., 1925.
- ESSENTIALS OF CIVILIZATION—*Thomas Jesse Jones*, Henry Holt, New York, 1929.
- THE SPIRIT OF AMERICA—*Henry Van Dyke*, Macmillan Co., New York, 1910.
- THE MODERN NOVEL—*Elizabeth A. Drew*, Macmillan Company, New York, 1926.
- READERS DIGEST—March, May, August, November, December in 1928, and January and March in 1929.
- REVIEW OF REVIEWS—January, 1930 (Andre Siegfried).





## NOTES AND REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup> Paul Valery—Variety (Chap. on "Intellectual Crisis"), p. 6
- <sup>2</sup> Philip Gibbs—The Day After Tomorrow, p. 119
- <sup>3</sup> Henry Seidel Canby—American Estimates, p. 13
- <sup>4</sup> Do., p. 112
- <sup>5</sup> Stuart Chase—Men and Machines, p. 149
- <sup>6</sup> Andre Siegfried—Review of Reviews, January, 1930
- <sup>7</sup> Henry Seidel Canby—American Estimates, p. 20
- <sup>8</sup> Rt. Rev. Nicholai Velmirovic—Spiritual Rebirth of Europe, p. 63 et seq.
- <sup>9</sup> Philip Gibbs—The Day After Tomorrow, p. 4
- <sup>10</sup> Do., p. 17
- <sup>11</sup> Stuart Chase—Men and Machines, p. 271
- <sup>12</sup> Edward A. Ross—Principles of Sociology, p. 313
- <sup>13</sup> Samuel Dill—Roman Society, p. 100
- <sup>14</sup> Raymond B. Fosdick—The Old Savage in the New Civilization, p. 71
- <sup>15</sup> Do., pp. 68-69
- <sup>16</sup> Stuart Chase—Men and Machines, p. 145
- <sup>17</sup> Carlton J. Hayes—Political and Social History of Modern Europe, Vol. I, p. 437
- <sup>18</sup> Edward A. Ross—Principles of Sociology, p. 325
- <sup>19</sup> Henry Seidel Canby—American Estimates, p. 4
- <sup>20</sup> Lewis F. Carr—Reader's Digest, Jan., 1929, p. 517
- <sup>21</sup> Clive Bell—Civilization, p. 234
- <sup>22</sup> William Lawrence—The New American, p. 26
- <sup>23</sup> Chas. A. Beard—Whither Mankind?, p. 23
- <sup>24</sup> Edward A. Steiner—The Making of a Great Race, p. 46

- 25 F. S. Marvin—The Living Past, p. 271  
26 Do., p. 272  
27 Revelations, Chapter 21  
28 Psalms, 10:14  
29 F. S. Marvin—The Living Past, p. 173  
30 John Dewey—Character and Events, p. 451  
31 Chas. A. Beard—Whither Mankind?, p. 334  
32 Suzanne La Follette—Art in America, p. 46  
33 Edward A. Steiner—The Making of a Great Race, p. 62  
34 Do., p. 69  
35 Chas. A. Beard—Toward Civilization, p. 283  
36 Edward A. Ross—Principles of Sociology, Chap. I  
37 Henry Truslow Adams, Harper's, February, 1928  
38 Do.  
39 Andre Siegfried—America Comes of Age, p. 239  
40 John Dewey—Character and Events, p. 451  
41 Do.  
42 Andre Siegfried—America Comes of Age, p. 278  
43 Do., p. 244  
44 Edward A. Ross—Principles of Sociology, p. 305  
45 Chas. A. Beard—Toward Civilization (Introduction)  
46 Henry Suzzallo—Our Faith in Education, p. 63  
47 Chas. A. Beard—Whither Mankind?, p. 360  
48 Henry Suzzallo—Our Faith in Education, p. 63  
49 Gillan, Dittmer, and Colbert—Social Problems, p. 33  
50 Suzanne La Follette—Art in America, Chap. V  
51 Rockwell Kent—Recent Gains In American Civilization  
(Edited by Kirby Page), p. 210  
52 Do., p. 212  
53 Arthur M. Schlesinger—A Political and Social History  
of The United States, Chap. II  
54 Mary Austin—Recent Gains In American Civilization  
(Edited by Kirby Page), p. 197  
55 Elizabeth A. Drew—The Modern Novel, p. 151  
56 Gillan, Dittmer, and Colbert—Social Problems, p. 121  
57 Edward A. Steiner—The Making of a Great Race, p. 25













UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



125 453

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY

